

Vol. XXXVI.

JULY, 1959

No. 3.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart — Rev. R. Donohoe, Kingston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, R.I., V.F., Terang, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Bunbury — Rt. Rev. C. Cunningham, V.G., Albany, W.A.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. G. Kane, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore — Rt. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., V.F., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Pirie — Very Rev. W. Kain, R.I., V.F., Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton — Rt. Rev. D. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Very Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Rt. Rev. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.

Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:

V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,

St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 177

Papal Allocation on Roman Synod and Oecumenical Council
—Allocation to Venetian pilgrims—Answer of Holy Office
to query concerning the votes given by Catholics to parties
associated with Communists—Queries on the radio recital of
the Rosary—An invocation endowed with indulgences—
Apostolic Indulgences—Papal Letter to Archbishop Duhig on
centenary of Queensland.

THE EFFECTS OF CONFIRMATION: RECENT
CONTROVERSIES, I. Rev. Clement Tierney, D.D. 190

THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER: A NEW
HYPOTHESIS, III. Rev. Jerome Crowe, C.P. 202

MORAL THEOLOGY. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 213

Obligation of Pastor to administer Confirmation in danger of
death—Duty to inform patient of his imminent death—
Causa de vita coniugali—Competency of the State to
determine marriage cases.

CANON LAW. Very Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, P.C., D.C.L. 225
Questions concerning Baptismal Sponsors by proxy.

LITURGY. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 231

Supplying the ceremonies of Baptism and Extreme Unction
Removing surplus oil from baptismal font—Incensation
of font—Mass without a server—Rubric at Benediction.

HOMILETICS Rev. Bede Heather, S.T.L., L.S.S. 237
St. Stephen's Defence (Acts 7:2-53).

NOTES. 242

The Faith and Modern Thought (Rev. Francis Mecham,
M.A.)—Subject for an author.

BOOK REVIEWS. 256

Guide for Religious Administrators (Hopper); The Lapsed:
The Unity of the Catholic Church (St. Cyprian: Ancient
Christian Writers); The Proximate Aim of Education
(O'Brien); Science and Metaphysics (Russell); Life and its
Origin (Fothergill); Whitehead's Philosophy of Physics
(Bright); Christianity and American Freemasonry (Whalen);
Living the Interior Life (Meyer); Gibbon and Rome (Oliver);
Our Lady: Queen of the Religious Life (Colin).

SHORT NOTICES

230, 236, 255.

Nihil Obstat:

**GULIELMUS LEONARD
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.**

Imprimatur:

**✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.**

Ia die, Julii, 1959.

Official Documents

SOLEMN ALLOCUTION

*To the Cardinals present at St. Paul's Outside-the-Walls, on
January 25, 1959.*

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons,

This festive recurrence of the conversion of St. Paul has gathered us together around the tomb of the Apostle. Such a solemn meeting at the glorious basilica of the Ostian Way has suggested to Us a communication of Our mind, with full confidence in your goodness and understanding. We wish to touch some particularly prominent points of apostolic activity which these first three months of contact with the ecclesiastical life of Rome have impressed upon Us.

Our sole aim is the good of souls and Our desire is to create a correspondence, quite clear-cut and definite, between the new Pontificate and the spiritual needs of the present time.

We know that from many quarters, some friendly and fervent, some malevolent, or uncertain, eyes are turned towards the new Pope in expectation of the characteristic lead which men have a right to hope from him.

It is quite natural that upon the tissue of the daily activity, which comprises the ever-increasing and ordinary manifestations of the pastoral task, there should be some point more distinctly fixed, to set, as it were, a note which, while not being the one sole and principal note of a Pontificate, should nevertheless give expressive lineaments to a regime of pastoral rule, which is now taking its place, more or less happily, in history.

With this thought in mind, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons, We consider the twofold task entrusted to a Successor of St. Peter. He is Bishop of Rome, and Shepherd of the universal Church. Hence he bears a double responsibility. These two offices are two expressions of one sole heavenly investiture; two commitments which cannot be separated, and which must be fused in unity for the encouragement and the edification of the whole christian people.

First of all, there is Rome. In the course of some forty years, which have passed since Our youth, it has been transformed into quite another city from that which We then knew.

Here and there the older fundamental architectural lines are visible. It is, however, difficult at times to trace them, especially at the periphery, which is now crowded with agglomerations of houses and houses and houses. That means families and families congregated here from every part of the Italian peninsula, from the adjacent islands and (one can say) from the whole world. It is a beehive of human occupants, from which one hears an uninterrupted buzz of human voices. All are in search of an atmosphere of neighbourliness. Little alliances are easily made and unmade and consequently the effort to create unity of spirit is a tiresome and slow affair. The marshalling of constructive forces in view of an order corresponding to the needs of the religious, civic and social life of the City (the Urbs) is not easy.

The Cardinal Vicar has most diligently put Us in contact with the spiritual condition of Rome from the point of view of religious practice, of the running of various institutions of a parochial character, of worship, social assistance, instruction. It is a pleasing thing for Us to pay tribute, on this occasion, to the reality of very commendable effort on the part of His Eminence and his collaborators. That good effort has been characterised by alacrity, constancy and vigilance. It has been an apostolate exercised from the top to the outmost borders by the clergy, secular and regular, and by their collaborators from the Catholic Associations. Their apostolate has been carried out with right and clear intentions and with sincere and persevering industry.

On the other hand, it happens that the episode of the Gospels—that, namely, of the crowds called to follow Our Lord and draw near to Him—renews itself according to the same patterns. The sight of poor human beings unable to find the nourishing food of grace touches the anxious heart of the pastor. A few loaves, a few fishes: “quid sunt inter tantos?” With this hint at facts, everything is said. Increase of provisions is needed: increase of energies, of co-ordination calculated to produce, with the help of the Lord, a more intense spiritual cultivation in view of more abundant fruitage in the sense of the prayer: “Adveniat regnum tuum.” In other words, the fervour of parochial and diocesan life must be intensified and made to fructify.

Now, if the Bishop of Rome turns his eyes into distance and views the whole world, the responsibility of whose spiritual

rule he carries in virtue of the divine mission entrusted to him through succession to the supreme apostolate—oh! what a spectacle. The vision is surely bright where the grace of Christ continues to multiply fruits and portents of spiritual uplift, of salvation and sanity, everywhere in the world; the vision is dark and sad, on the other hand, where human liberty is abused or compromised, where men not knowing that the heavens are opened, not accepting faith in Christ the Son of God, Redeemer of the world and Founder of the Church, give themselves entirely to the quest of earthly goods, under the inspiration of him whom the Gospel calls the prince of darkness, the prince of this world—as Jesus Himself called him in His discourse after the Supper. Darkness reigns where men level war against what is true and good. In this realm of darkness is evident that lamentable condition which accentuates the division between the two societies, called by the genius of St. Augustine “the two cities.” And the city of this world always continues to activate those efforts that confuse and deceive, and, if possible, would seduce the elect and drag them to ruin.

To make matters worse, the children of God and of the Church are being enticed and attracted to the advantages of a material order, which the progress of modern techniques—indifferent in itself—magnifies and exalts.

All this—We mean, this progress—while it distracts from the quest of higher things, weakens the energies of the spirit. It leads to relaxation of the bonds of discipline and of ancient good order, with grave prejudice to what constituted the Church’s power of resistance to error. Errors which the children of the Church did not prove strong to resist, brought, in the course of history, fatal and calamitous divisions, spiritual and moral decadence, the ruin of nations.

The consideration of these facts stirs up in the heart of the humble priest, whom Providence has raised to this height of Supreme Pontificate, a decided resolution to renew some ancient forms of doctrinal affirmation and some wise ordinances of ecclesiastical discipline—such, namely, as, in periods of renewal, gave fruits of extraordinary efficacy, standing for clarity of thought, for compactness of religious unity, for a more living flame of christian fervour, which we continue to recognize as we read history. This will enrich the earth also with abundance “*de rore caeli et de pinguedine terrae*” (Gen. 27:28).

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons, We are at this moment pronouncing before you, with a tremour of emotion, certainly, but with humble resolution of purpose, the name and the proposal of a twofold celebration: a Diocesan Synod for Rome and an Ecumenical Council for the universal Church.

For you, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons, there is no need to illustrate with copious explanation the historical and juridical significance of these two proposals. They will lead happily to the desired modernization of the Code of Canon Law, which should accompany and crown these two specimens of disciplinary provision in practical application. The provisions that are required the Spirit of the Lord will suggest to Us along the way. The approaching promulgation of the Code of Oriental Law gives the pre-announcement of these events.

For to-day let this communication, made to the Sacred College here, suffice. We intend to transmit it to the Cardinals, who have returned to their episcopal Sees throughout the world.

We shall be pleased to have from each one of those present and of those far away an intimate and frankly confident word assuring Us of the dispositions of each one, and amiably offering Us suggestions for the realization of this triple design.

The knowledge, which We had already, and which three months of introduction to the service "*servorum Dei*," has confirmed and increased, encourages Us to confide in the grace of heaven: above all in the intercession of the Immaculate Mother of Jesus and our Mother; in the protection of Saints Peter and Paul, Princes of the Apostles; also of SS. John the Baptist and the Evangelist, Our particular Patrons; and of the whole heavenly court. From all We implore a good beginning, continuation and happy success of these purposes of hard work, for the enlightenment, edification and joy of the whole Christian people. They convey also renewed invitation to the faithful of the separated Communities to follow Us lovingly in this quest for unity and grace, for which so many souls long in every part of the world.

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons! We find sweetness and courage in the words of St. Leo the Great—words which the Sacred Liturgy now invites us to recite more often. He incorporates in the passage the salute of St. Paul, which today, the feast of Saul's conversion at Damascus, sounds more solemn, since we are gathered at the place of his greatest memorial.

It is both Leo and Paul that say: "Corona mea . . . et gaudium vos estis, si fides vestra, quae ab initio Evangelii in universo mundo praedicata est, in dilectione et sanctitate permanserit" (S. Leo M. Sermo 2).

What a salute this is! altogether worthy of Our spiritual family. Dilectio et sanctitas: a salute and an omen. Benedictio Dei omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

ALLOCUTION TO PILGRIMS FROM VENICE

Dear children from Venice—I am deeply moved by your presence here to-day. You have come to salute me, after little more than four months since my separation from you, a date which marked the beginning of the new regime of activity which Jesus placed upon me as Pastor of the universal Church.

Seeing you again, after those first experiences of the supreme pontificate, it is only natural that a sense of tender affection should invade my heart. You, my dear Venetians, know how to understand me. There is no need for further effusion of words.

This is the way that the Lord has directed all the steps of my humble life. He has brought me here, to give Him the last years of my life, before receiving me, as I hope, into His happy eternity.

May He be blessed, and you must all bless Him, together with me, dear children of my beloved Venice.

I like to look upon your pilgrimage from the charming Lagoon to the banks of the Tiber as an act of homage to the sacred persons of three Pontiffs. Their names remain particularly bound to Venice, the Queen of the Adriatic, to that Venice which ruled the seas during centuries and centuries of glorious history, that Venice which was always a fascinating city and a luminous point of attraction for all countries of the earth.

The three Pontiffs are St. Peter, St. Pius X and John XXIII. St. Peter was the first Pope of the Holy Church of Christ. He was the Prince of the Apostles, and he was so closely united in spiritual friendship with the principal Patron of Venice, namely, St. Mark (our own St. Mark the Evangelist) that he called him his son. "Mark, my son, salutes you," he wrote.

The second Pope which we must very particularly connect with Venice is St. Pius X. He passed to the Roman Chair of Peter from the patriarchal See of St. Mark; he shone with the

light of sanctity and universal ministry, and left his mortal body to rest under the vaults of this very basilica, beside the sacred tomb of the Apostles, of the martyrs, of the Pontiffs of all ages.

The third Pope, whose name is tied to Venice, is your last Patriarch, who is speaking to you still. Providence deigned to number him as most recent in the series of the Servants of the Servants of God—deigned to call him, though unworthy, to the great honour of presiding over the whole Christian flock scattered throughout the entire world—in *toto orbe terrarum*, as the Canon of the Mass phrases it.

It is from these three personages, always living; two in heavenly glory, the third still in the furrow of this mortal life, that I desire to draw three admonitions, both encouraging and precious, for your spiritual progress, as perfect Christians.

I. Before and above everything, my dear children of Venice, you must keep your fidelity to the Church—One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. Jesus did not found several Churches, but one Church only. That Church is not the Church of Venice, or the Church of Milan, or the Gallican Church, or the Greek Church, or the Slav Church. It does not bear the name of any nation. It is the one apostolic and universal Church.

Yes, the Church of Christ is the Church of Rome. She is the true Mother of all nations, splendid in the variety of her rites, in the use of various languages; she varies according to the liturgical developments of various times and various peoples, but always holds one only flame of belief and discipline, of order and of sacred organisation.

It was St. Ambrose who wrote the famous saying: *Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia* ("where Peter is, there the Church is"). The motto has a special application to those whose patron is St. Mark. St. Mark was the spiritual son of St. Peter and consequently St. Peter Damian said: *Ubi Marcus ibi Petrus* ("where Mark is, there Peter is"). Where the family of St. Mark is, there the Church is. Therefore, no divisions, no subdivisions. We all live under the same heaven; we are all Catholics in the same way. This was the mind of the Divine Founder of the Church, this was His will, this was His last prayer, in the hour of sacrifice: "O Father, this is what I ask of Thee: *ut unum sint*—that they may be one." The principle of unity for all the Churches, one with the other and all together, is the sacred bond that secures perennial indefectibility, and

the continuation of Christ's heritage throughout the centuries. All must be united to the first Apostle of the Lord. According to the episcopal motto of a great Bishop of the ancient Church: It is for Catholics, he said, *cum Petro pugnare, et cum Petro regnare*—"to fight with Peter and to reign with Peter."

I know my sheep and my lambs of the Venetian flock so well that I can give assurance of the seriousness of their faith, of their religious profession.

In difficult and distant times, when the wind was blowing on the waves of the sea, threatening the little boat, some fluctuations were to be feared here and there; but at Venice less than in other places. The people always remained like a compact unit attached to the Apostolic Roman See. They were able to look out on the vast horizon with a sure eye and with warm love.

May it always be so! I remember Corpus Christi of last year, celebrated with the procession in Piazza San Marco. Cardinal Norman Gilroy, Archbishop of Sydney, was with us. I gave him the honour of carrying the Blessed Sacrament. That eminent Prelate was moved to fervent elation in his admiration of Venetian faith. The demonstration of the people's piety touched him so much that he referred to it again, when I met him on the threshold of the Conclave.

Venice and Sydney! They stand almost at the utmost ends of distance; they offer two grand panoramas, amongst the most beautiful and impressive in the world; but Sydney and Venice were and are united in a single chant of honour and glory to God, the chant of our common faith. It was an unforgettable sight and greatly encouraging.

II. The other Pontiff familiar to Venetian piety is Pius X, the most illustrious Patriarch after St. Lawrence Justinian, who was the first. Your fathers knew Cardinal Sarto well, and they still bless his beloved name.

This Basilica of St. Peter now holds his glorious body, and in order to do honour to an engagement taken by himself when he was alive, his body will be taken to Venetian soil and rest for a while under the golden vaults of his former cathedral. There it will receive the veneration of the children of those who knew him well and loved him. These honours should prove triumphal, even though they must be limited to a few weeks.

Your visit to-day, beloved children of Venice, is a courteous invitation to your one-time Patriarch to allow himself to be taken to the land of his birth, made illustrious for ever by the memories of his holy life.

The holiness and greatness of Pius X was attained in the sublime exercise of a pastoral life, during his years as Patriarch of Venice. It was a holiness and a greatness which later became a splendour of doctrine and sacred ministry towards souls from the Chair of St. Peter, where his name shone with bright light and remains glorious.

Let me bring into prominence, for continual edification, the fourfold fervour of the pastoral spirit of St. Pius X:

(1) Fervour for Christian teaching, which should be popular but strong and well-ordered, teaching of the sacred truths to the young generations and to those who belonged to the various classes in the social scale; (2) fervour for the cult of the Eucharist, which through St. Pius had developments altogether unexpected and even prodigious, for the nourishment of supernatural life in individual souls, in families and in the whole body of the Church; (3) for the reform of ecclesiastical discipline by bringing legislation into harmony with the dynamism of modern life — legislation susceptible of modernisations, according to the new conditions developing in the fever of modern thought and activity; (4) fervour, lastly, for the assertion (often heroic) of the sacred principles of liberty and for revealed truth, for the liberty and teaching mission of Holy Church, the liberty and inviolability of the Gospel of Christ, the prevailing power of which must be kept free from every contamination of error and evil.

Setting ourselves resolutely on these tracks of doctrine and discipline means most certainly that we provide for genuine spiritual well-being, which is the basis of all progress, even in the temporal order of this present life.

In view of this, the continued and intensified cult of St. Pius X should be a characteristic point of life and of practical activity for every good Venetian. This will be for his own consolation and success, and for an assured blessing upon his family and his future.

III. The third Pontiff, whom you came to visit, bringing a tribute of homage to his person, is the same humble man,

priest and pastor, who presented and described himself to you at San Marco on the evening of the 15th of March, six years ago, when he began his ministry among you.

I will say with the Psalm: "Thy right hand upheld me, O Lord, and Thy merciful solicitude made me great" (Ps. 17). This is the mystery of my life. Do not look for other explanations. The saying of St. Gregory Nazianzen has been a familiar thought with me: "Not our will, but the will of God is our peace."

I entered Venice on Laetare Sunday. It is a comfort for my spirit to repeat these things on Passion Sunday. To rejoice and to suffer is equally a motive of serene joy. In the will and in the power of Our Lord Jesus Christ we are strong. His teaching and his example are the light and the comfort of our changing human life, of the intimate union of that which is in us of the human and of the divine.

Beloved children of Venice! Once more I thank you for your visit. I think of all those who are here in spirit. I think and pray and will pray always for all of you and for each, remembering also those who have passed to the other shore and are joyfully awaiting us.

How much time the Lord will give me to labour and serve Him in His servants (which now means the immense flock of the Christian people) I do not know and I am not anxious to know it. I always hold myself ready to live and to die.

With special reference to you, dear Venetians, I wish to assure you that I do not intend to give up the ideal of paternity towards all and towards each one. That will be my tranquil and serene joy as long as I live—et ultra (and beyond).

In the Breviary of last Friday I recited with great relish Psalm 105, the beginning of which contains an admonition and a good wish for me and for you. It is sweet for me to repeat the precious words, for they breathe joyful quiet, abandonment and peace.

"Give praise to the Lord, for He is good: for this mercy continues for ever—blessed are those, who keep thy commandments, O Lord: who always do that which is just—Remember me, O Lord, according to thy good will: thy good will towards thy people: Visit me with Thy help that I may rejoice in the joy of thy people: and glory with the heirs of Thy blessings."

O Venice! O people of Venice! always most dear to my heart: "May I rejoice in the joy of thy people: may I glory with those who are heirs of thy blessings." Amen, amen.

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

Query

The question has been put to this Supreme Sacred Congregation, whether it is lawful for catholic citizens, in electing representatives of the people, to give their votes to those parties or candidates, who, though not professing principles opposed to catholic doctrine, and even taking the name of Christian, are, however, in reality associated with communists, and favour them by their way of acting.

On Wednesday, March 25, 1959, Their Most Eminent and Reverend Lordships, the Cardinals entrusted with the safeguarding of faith and morals, decreed the answer as follows:

No, in accordance with the Decree of the Holy Office, July 1, 1949, n. 1 (A.A.S. vol. LI, 1949, p. 334).

On Thursday, April 2, our Holy Father, John XXIII, by divine providence Pope, in an audience granted to the Most Eminent and Reverend Lord Cardinal Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office, heard the decree of the Eminent Fathers, approved it and ordered it to be published.

Given at Rome from the Palace of the H.O., Apr. 4, 1959.

HUGH O'FLAHERTY, *Notary*.

SACRED APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY

(Office of Indulgences)

Queries on the radio recital of the Rosary

Query I: Whether the faithful can gain the Indulgences attached to the Rosary of the B.V.M. if they recite it with another, who is only present by radio.

Reply: Yes.

Query II: Whether the faithful can gain the aforesaid Indulgences, if they recite the Rosary of the B.V.M. in alternate

parts, while one part of the prayers is transmitted by radio, the recitation being done by a person who is not present here and now but has had his voice previously recorded on a disk or on tape.

Reply: No.

From the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary, Oct. 8, 1958.

N. Card. CANALI, *Major Penitentiary*.

J. ROSSI, *Secretary*.

The same Office of Indulgences, under date of December 6, publishes 300 days Indulgence for the invocation: "Jesus, King of love, I have confidence in your merciful love"—a plenary, on the usual conditions, once a month, if it is recited daily.

APOSTOLIC INDULGENCES

Under date of November 22, 1958, the Apostolic Penitentiary published the Apostolic Indulgences attached to pious objects blessed by the Supreme Pontiff himself or by a priest having the relative faculty, on the condition of the other special requirements being satisfied.

1. For various pious actions and works performed at least once a week a plenary Indulgence may be gained, on the usual conditions of confession, communion and prayer for the Pope's intention: on all the greater feasts of our Lord and of the Christian Mysteries, of our Lady, of St. John the Baptist, of St. Joseph, of the Apostles, and on the feast of All Saints.

Without confession and communion, if the person prays for the Pope's intention with a contrite heart, he may gain a partial Indulgence of seven years.

For the single works or pious actions a partial toties quoties of three years is granted.

2. A priest who celebrates Mass each day may gain the same plenary Indulgence on the said feasts, and five years for each Mass, if he prays, as above, for the Pope's intentions.

3. The same holds for the daily recital of the Divine Office. Those who recite it may gain a plenary on the said feasts in the same way. Without confession and communion, but with contrite heart, a partial of five years is available for each daily office.

4. For the Angelus (or Regina Coeli) and the "De profundis" (at the first hour of night) the Indulgence of 500 days is given.

5. This same Indulgence is attached to pious meditation on the Passion (aliquantisper) accompanied by three Paters and Aves.

6. Three hundred days are attached to examination of conscience accompanied by one Pater, Ave, Gloria in honour of the Holy Trinity, or five Glorias in memory of the five Wounds.

7. The same Indulgence is annexed to a Pater and Ave for the Dying.

8. The Indulgence (a plenary) "in articulo mortis" is in the usual form (the conditions being acceptance of death and commendation of one's soul, confession and communion and invocation of the Holy Name).

These are the Apostolic Indulgences of the present Pontificate, for the gaining of which it is required that one should carry the blessed object on one's person or keep it becomingly in his house.

PAPAL LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP DUHIG ON CENTENARY OF THE CHURCH IN QUEENSLAND

Venerabili Fratri, JACOBO DUHIG,

Brisbanensi Archiepiscopo,

JOANNES PP. XXIII.

Venerabilis Frater,

salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

A Brisbane Ecclesiae ortu cum centum fauste compleantur anni, piaie mentis consilio permotus tu, Venerabilis Frater, publica sacra indixisti sollemnia, ut Deo Uni et Trino, a quo omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum (cfr. Jac. 1, 17), laetitiis sanctis effusae actiones gratiarum persolvantur.

Quod facere in animo habes, id et laudamus et probamus, admodum idcirco gavisi, quod Nobis secunda datur occasio tibi gregique, cui sollers sacer pastor invigilas, caritatis Nostrae signum indiciumque proferendi.

E prospero rerum progressu, quo Dioecesis ista firmis viribus crevit, haud dubie patet ei, veluti evangelico semini, Deum propitium florentis vitae incrementa dedisse: quod satis creber sacerdotum et religiosorum sodalium numerus, constitutae

paroeciae, templa a solo excitata, ephebea, scholae, valetudinaria, orphanotrophia, piaae sodalitates, caritati fovendae et auxilio egenis ferendo opera aperte et magnifice testantur. His omnibus maius quoque obtigit: in Queenslandensis Civitatis finibus, quae auspiciatissimo eventu eodem tempore natalem assecuta est, aliae quattuor ex ista Dioecesi partae sunt: scilicet Rockhamptoniensis, Townsvilleensis, Toowoombaensis, Cairnensis, quae cunctae, ut par est, statarum celebritatum erunt participes, quemadmodum ex eodem caelestis bonitatis fonte dona ubertim hauserunt.

Nobis magnum oblectamentum ob communem futuram vestram utilitatem id affert, quod, saeculari hac vertente memoria, Provinciale sacrum Seminarium Pii XII nomine nuncupatum, affabre exstructum, sollemni ritu dicitur. Paternis cupimus votis, ut ibidem sacrorum alumni numero crescant, virtutibus niteant, Ecclesiae quam plurimum emolumenti et decoris collaturi. Hanc ob rem pura, actiosa, pia aetate proficientes, artiore usque foedere caelestis amoris ignes et divinarum humanarumque rerum scientiam una simul coniungant: nam ardere et lucere perfectum.

Minime dubitamus, quin huiusmodi coetus et celebritates Ecclesiae in Queenslandensi ditione filiis valido hortamento sint, ut caritatis vinculis solidioribus coalescant, magis magisque sacris pastoribus dicto audientes, altius Dei leges servant, sanctitate et probitate morum prestant, pro Jesu Christi nomine et gloria bene agendi studio inardescant. In via Domini non pigre consistendum, sed alacriter ambulandum est "Eat ergo Ecclesia, ambulet: facta est via, strata nostra ab imperatore munita est. Ferveamus in itineribus bonorum operum, hoc est enim nostrum ambulare" (S. Aug. In Ps. XXXII, Enarr. 11, Sermo 11, 10).

Haec ex animo ominati, tibi, Venerabilis Frater, et ceteris Queenslandensibus sacris pastoribus et Christi ovis, curis vestris commissis, uberrima et praesentissima a Deo precamur auxilia atque, horum pignus, Apostolicam Benedictionem vobis universis, ad praeclara molienda incitamentum, impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die XVII mensis maii in festo Pentecostes, anno MCMLIX, Pontificatus Nostri primo.

Joannes PP. XXIII.

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

The Effects of Confirmation, 1.

RECENT CONTROVERSIES

One of the central problems of confirmation is to determine the effects that the sacrament accomplishes in the christian life. It is not sufficient to say that confirmation confers grace. The same can be said of six other rites instituted by Christ. If confirmation is a distinct sacrament, then it must produce its own distinctive effect. Confirmation must confer on the soul a grace which is peculiar to itself, a grace which is not conferred by any other sacrament. These considerations form the starting point of St. Thomas's entire treatise on the sacrament of confirmation. "The sacraments of the new law are ordered to the production of special effects of grace: and therefore where there is a special effect of grace, there we find a special sacrament ordered towards that end."¹

In recent years the sacrament of confirmation has been the subject of lively discussion on the part of both catholic and non-catholic theologians. Since a considerable amount of attention has been focused on the meaning and the effects of the sacrament, we would like to present our readers with a chronicle of the discussion and underline some of the results that have been achieved.

THE PROBLEM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In trying to determine the proper effect of confirmation, the theologian is confronted with a problem which stems from sacred scripture itself. According to the data of the New Testament confirmation is the sacrament which confers the Holy Spirit. In the Acts of the Apostles we find two descriptions of the process of christian initiation which reach their climax with an imposition of hands. At Samaria Peter and John complete the work of the deacon evangelist Philip. They impose hands on the recently baptised christians and the Holy Spirit is conferred. "When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John, who came down and prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit; for as yet he was fallen upon none of them, but they had only been baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the

¹S.Th., Illa P. 72, I.

Holy Spirit. But when Simon saw that the Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles' hands, he offered them money, saying, 'Give me also this power, so that on whomsoever I lay my hands, he receive the Holy Spirit.'"² At Ephesus the same procedure is followed. The twelve disciples are first baptised; then, Paul imposes hands and the Holy Spirit descends. "They were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul laid his hands upon them the Holy Spirit came upon them."³ Thus confirmation is characterised in sacred scripture as a descent of the Holy Spirit, a conferring of the Holy Spirit, a reception of the Holy Spirit. The same perspective is retained in the liturgical texts. In the Roman Liturgy the prayers which surround and develop the central rite of chrismation, speak of the sacrament in terms of a communication of the Holy Spirit.

But sacred scripture and tradition are equally insistent on a second truth. The Christian has already received the Holy Spirit in baptism. St. Paul declares that all the baptised are united and incorporated into the one body of Christ through the activity of the Spirit.⁴ He describes baptism as a justification in the Spirit of our God, as the renovation of the Spirit.⁵ In the first christian sermon it is possible that St. Peter intends to establish a relation between baptism and the reception of the Spirit in his exhortation to the repentant Jews. "Be baptised every one of you . . . and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."⁶ In his conversation with Nicodemus Our Lord himself presents baptism as a rebirth from water and the Spirit.⁷ Hence the Holy Spirit has already intervened in the life of the Christian through the waters of regeneration. Christian baptism is a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Thus the New Testament presents the theologian with a problem which must be resolved. Confirmation is the sacrament which confers the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit has already been received in baptism. After the baptismal gift of the Spirit there is a second gift of the Spirit in confirmation. What, then, is the exact nature and purpose of this new gift of the Spirit, of this second mission of the Spirit in the sacramental life of

² Acts, 8, 14-19.

³ Acts, 19, 1-7.

⁴ ICor., 12, 13.

⁵ ICor., 6, 11; Tit. 3, 5.

⁶ Acts, 2, 38.

⁷ John, 3, 6.

the Christian? To answer this question is to determine the precise place that confirmation holds in the Christian life and in the sacramental economy, to justify its existence as a sacrament distinct from baptism, to explain the mutual relation between the two sacraments of christian initiation.⁸

We can begin by outlining two answers to the proposed question. The first solution is sponsored by non-catholic theologians, the second by catholic theologians.

THE DILEMMA

Among non-catholic theologians there is a marked tendency to formulate the problem of the relation between baptism and confirmation in terms of a dilemma. Either the Holy Spirit is conferred in baptism which bestows all that is needed to constitute a true and perfect Christian, and confirmation is simply an accessory rite which involves a fuller realisation and conscious appreciation of the indwelling presence of the Spirit; or else it is confirmation which imparts the gift of the Spirit constituting a true and perfect Christian, and baptism is an incomplete rite which demands confirmation for its sacramental completion. "The Holy Spirit either intervenes in baptism, or he does not intervene. In the first case confirmation is superfluous, in the second case confirmation is necessary."⁹

The problem is proposed in the form of a dilemma, and it is resolved in two opposite ways. Dom Gregory Dix starts with the principle that the Holy Spirit does not intervene in the baptism of water. In the process of christian initiation the washing with water has a negative effect, the purification of the soul from sin; while the anointing with chrism has a positive effect, the communication of the Holy Spirit.

This is the thesis which was expounded by Gregory Dix in the course of a public lecture delivered at the University of Oxford, and later published in book-form under the title *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*.¹⁰ He begins by placing a strong emphasis on the unity of the rite of initiation in the early church. Up till the third century the washing with water and the anointing with chrism were envisaged as

⁸Cfr. Th. Camelot, *La Theologie de la Confirmation a la lumiere des controverses recentes: La Maison Dieu*, 54 (1958), p. 86.

⁹B. Botte, *B.T.A.M.*, T. VI (1952), n. 1630.

¹⁰Dom Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*, Westminster, 1946.

constituent elements of a single rite of baptism (p. 21). We must remember that in christian antiquity the word *baptism* does not have its modern significance. When an ancient author uses the word *baptisma* or *baptismum* we can never simply assume that he means no more than an ablution with water (p. 17). The word baptism is a comprehensive term which embraces both the washing with water and the anointing with oil. Thus in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus we find that the entire rite of initiation, involving what we now call baptism and confirmation, is covered by the single title 'The Tradition of Holy Baptism' (p. 14).

In this single rite of baptism the washing with water is the act which purifies the soul and prepares the way for the Holy Spirit, and the effusion of oil is the act which confers the gift of the Spirit. Thus the original ceremony of initiation was composed of two constituent elements, designated in modern theology as baptism and confirmation, which were related to each other as bread and wine in the eucharist (p. 21). These two elements constituted the one sacrament, the one baptism from water and the Spirit, which produces the regeneration described by Christ in his conversation with Nicodemus. The western church eventually separated the two halves of the primitive rite, and formed the two separate sacraments of baptism and confirmation (p. 37).

This dissociation of baptism from confirmation was not necessarily a step in the wrong direction, since the postponing of confirmation made room for that conscious response of faith which was absent from the baptism of infants. The error of the western church was to separate the two sacraments on the level of doctrine (p. 37). The whole content and meaning of the primitive rite of initiation was transferred to the washing with water, which is henceforth regarded as the rite which communicates the Holy Spirit. The supernatural content of the confirmation rite, the Spirit-baptism of the early church, is now so impoverished that the mediaeval theologians can no longer explain its function in the christian life. Some of them begin to ask the inevitable question: whether confirmation is really a sacrament instituted by Christ, and whether it is not, in fact, superfluous (p. 30).

If the modern church is to find its way out of the impasse

into which it has been led by a false theological development, then it must return, not to the practice, but rather to the mental outlook of the early church. Baptism must be regarded as wholly incomplete of its very nature, and absolutely needing completion by the gift of the Spirit conferred in confirmation (p. 38).

It is possible to illustrate Dix's theological position in regard to the thought of the early church by means of a simple analogy. Just as the one complete act of breathing involves an act of exhalation which expels stale air from the lungs and an act of inhalation which introduces fresh air into the lungs, so also the one complete act of initiation involves a washing with water which expels sin from the soul and an effusion of chrism which introduces the Holy Spirit into the soul. Until the Spirit is conferred by the anointing the one sacramental action is incomplete and still in process.

The thesis proposed by Dix is of considerable interest, not only because of the flair and brilliance with which he assembles and presents his data, but because he pursues a line of thought which is discernible in the patristic texts and reduces it to a rigid theological system. Among the ecclesiastical writers there is a tendency to explain the relation between baptism and confirmation on the basis of negative and positive effects. The washing with water remits sin. The anointing with chrism, or the imposition of hands, confers the Holy Spirit. In the first monograph ever written on baptism, Tertullian distinguishes between the two phases of Christian initiation and distributes the effects according to the schema of purification and reception of the Spirit. "It is not in water that we receive the Holy Spirit. But purified by water we are prepared to receive the Spirit. . . . Then hands are imposed, calling on and inviting the Holy Spirit by a prayer of benediction. This Spirit, most holy, is well pleased to descend on the body which has been purified."¹¹ There is evidence of the same tendency in the writings of St. Cyprian, and Pacian of Barcelona seems to formulate the thesis of Dix with an exact theological precision. "Sins are cleansed in the bath of baptism, the Holy Spirit intervenes in the chrism."¹²

In assessing the value of such statements we must bear in mind that they do not represent a universal tradition, that their

¹¹*De Bapt.* 6-8; *Sources Chretiennes*, pp. 75-77.

¹²*Sermo de bapt.* 6; P.L. 13, 1093.

authors have no intention of formulating a balanced theological system and that they do not reproduce the complete thought even of the writers in question. These Fathers attribute far more extensive effects to the baptismal washing than the negative remission of sins. They consider that baptism regenerates and justifies the soul. Already, we are forced to abandon the rigid classification of negative and positive effects. Moreover they admit that there is no remission of sins without the Holy Spirit; equally, that there is no regeneration without the Holy Spirit. Again, we are forced to abandon the principle that the baptismal washing does not confer the Holy Spirit.

In his calm and penetrating analysis of the current trends in the theology of confirmation, Pere Camelot assembles a small dossier of liturgical texts which reveal the inadequacies of a system which excludes the Holy Spirit from the baptism of water.¹³ There is the formula of the Apostolic Tradition: "Lord God, thou hast made them worthy to merit remission of sins through the bath of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, send down upon them thy grace." There is the liturgical prayer of St. Ambrose: "May God the Father almighty, who has regenerated thee from water and the Holy Spirit and remitted thy sins, may he anoint thee unto life everlasting." There is the formula of the Gregorian Sacramentary: "Almighty everlasting God, who has deigned to regenerate these thy servants and handmaids from water and the Holy Spirit, and has given them remission of all their sins, send down upon them thy seven-fold Spirit, the Paraclete." In all of these texts baptism is presented not only as a remission of sins, but also as a regeneration in the Holy Spirit.

Gregory Dix is left with the predicament of trying to account for the diverse effects which are attributed to water-baptism in the sources of revelation. In an article published in *Theology* (1948) he concedes that baptism in water implies more than a remission of sins. It involves an incorporation into Christ and his mystical body, but it does not confer any gift of the Spirit. It is difficult to see how baptism can incorporate the soul into the mystical body of Christ, a body which is animated by the Holy Spirit and lives the life of the Spirit, unless it also confers at least an initial gift of the Spirit.¹⁴

¹³Th. Camelot, Sur la theologie de la Confirmation: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques*, 1954, p. 644.

¹⁴This article of Gregory Dix, The Seal in the Second Century (*Theology*, 51, 1948, p. 7-12) is cited from the review of B. Botte, B.T.A.M., T.V. (1949) n. 1279.

In 1951 Professor G. W. Lampe entered the debate with a distinguished study *The Seal of the Spirit*, which explores the relation between baptism and confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers.¹⁵ Here we find that the thesis of Dix is refuted with a wealth of detail and scholarship, only to be replaced with the opposite solution which denies that the gift of the Spirit is conferred in confirmation. It is through baptism in water that the believer enters into possession of the Holy Spirit and receives the full endowment of his gifts. In the writings of the New Testament there is no trace of a conferring of the Spirit through a confirmation rite of imposing hands. Once again, the relation between baptism and confirmation is envisaged in terms of a dilemma, and the problem of the reception of the Spirit is governed by the inexorable logic of either . . . or. Either the christian receives the gift of the Spirit by virtue of his sacramental incorporation into Christ in baptism, or the gift of the Spirit is imparted, independently of baptism, through an imposition of hands in confirmation (p. 297).

Lampe admits that there are two passages in the Acts of the Apostles where the gift of the Spirit seems to be mediated through an imposition of hands which follows the rite of baptism in water. The first and most striking of these is the account of the visit of Peter and John to Samaria (Acts 8, 14-17); the second is the account of St. Paul's meeting with the twelve men of Ephesus who are introduced to us as disciples (Acts 19, 1-7). These passages provide the scriptural basis for the view that confirmation is the regular complement of baptism, that it is the rite by which the gift of the Spirit is conferred. But the events which took place at Samaria and Ephesus must be interpreted within the dimensions of St. Luke's limited conception of the role of the Spirit in the life of the community. The author of the Acts does not seem to display any great awareness or appreciation of the activity of the Spirit as the inner principle of the individual believer's life in Christ. He envisages the Spirit as the power which directs the missionary activity of the church, assisting the expansion of the kingdom of God by means of the missionary charismata of prophecy, tongues and the power to perform signs and wonders (p. 65). The original apostolic body, the nucleus of the church, received the Spirit in a startling and dramatic fashion at Pentecost. And

¹⁵G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, London, 1951.

at every decisive stage in the triumphant march of Christianity towards world conquest, at every crisis in the expanding life of the church, the Holy Spirit intervenes to assist the missionary enterprise by a renewal of the Pentecostal manifestation. This is the key to the interpretation of the visit of Peter and John to Samaria. "The preaching of the Gospel in Samaria represented a crucial moment in the advance of Christianity. Hence, after the Baptism of the first Samaritan converts, the leaders of the Church's mission come down from Jerusalem and, by a sign of fellowship and 'contact' incorporate them into the apostolic (i.e., missionary) Church, with the result that there occurs a Samaritan 'Pentecost,' at least to the extent that visible signs are manifested of the outpouring of the Spirit. It may not be too much to assert that this event is meant to demonstrate that a new nucleus of the missionary Church has been established, and to suggest that Luke's readers are intended to infer that the Gospel proceeded to radiate outwards from his new centre of the Spirit's mission" (p. 72). Thus the imposition of hands is not a rite of initiation, but an expression of solidarity and fellowship, a sign of incorporation into the missionary life and activity of the church.

The events which took place at Ephesus are more difficult to understand but the solution lies in a similar explanation. This too, is another critical moment in the missionary life of the church. Ephesus is destined to be a focal point from which Christianity will radiate and expand. "Next to Antioch, in fact in succession to Antioch, Ephesus is the centre of the Gentile mission, the headquarters where St. Paul makes his longest stay, and the centre from which missionary activity radiates into Asia Minor and St. Paul's emissaries visit his churches at Corinth and elsewhere. The planting of the Faith in this centre is clearly an event of immense importance, and it is natural that the first converts . . . should become a nucleus and focus of this new Church, the strategic centre of the Pauline preaching. They are accordingly given a token of their incorporation into the apostolic ministry represented by St. Paul himself, and the Spirit which guides and directs the Church's mission is manifested in them by the visible signs of 'tongues' and prophecy. They are made sharers in the active 'apostolicity' of the Church as soon as they have been incorporated into Christ by Baptism" (p. 76).

From an examination of the New Testament writings Lampe reaches a twofold conclusion. First, there is no proof at all for the view that the imposition of hands formed a regular part of the ritual of christian initiation in the apostolic church (p. 92). The whole weight of evidence indicates that the Christian received the full endowment of the Spirit in the baptism of water. Secondly, our sole source of information on the practice of imposing hands is St. Luke who has a highly individualistic conception of the role of the Spirit in the missionary life of the church. Hence, we can reasonably infer that the rite of imposing hands has nothing to do with confirmation, but is a kind of missionary ordination by which the members of the church are associated in her apostolic enterprise (p. 78).

Although the rite of confirmation is a post-scriptural development and does not confer the Holy Spirit, still it has a valuable and necessary function in the modern situation of the church. The sacrament of baptism is generally administered in infancy, and its effects are primarily potential rather than actual. It is perfectly true that the baptised infant is made a member of Christ's body, a child of God, an heir to the kingdom. He possesses the full endowment of the indwelling presence of the Spirit. But baptism is a unique event, a single moment which sums up and recapitulates within itself all the consequences of union with Christ. The realisation of what is actually involved in baptism is achieved only gradually in the course of a life-time. Confirmation is one of those highly significant moments when the Christian experiences a fresh awareness of the indwelling presence of the Spirit, and the benefits conferred in baptism are confirmed on the level of conscious apprehension. Confirmation does not confer a new gift of the Spirit, but rather a fresh awareness of the Spirit (p. 319).

Thus the anglican theology of confirmation centres around two conflicting propositions: (i) confirmation confers the gift of the Spirit (Dix), (ii) confirmation does not confer the gift of the Spirit (Lampe). It was between these two views that the Joint Committees of the Convocations of Canterbury and York had to choose in their Report *Baptism and Confirmation today* which was issued in 1955. The report was not unanimous. The High Church minority were in favour of the view proposed by Dix, while the majority supported Lampe.¹⁶

¹⁶Cfr. J. Crehan, Ten Years work on Baptism and Confirmation: *Theological Studies*, Dec. 1956, p. 510.

The approach of anglican divines to the whole question of the relation between baptism and confirmation is instructive. It emphasises a danger which the theologian must be careful to avoid, the danger of solving a problem by rigid logical solutions which are achieved by neglecting essential elements of the data. The systems constructed by Dix and Lampe have eliminated essential facts, guaranteed by the New Testament and tradition. Dix has failed to account for the evidence which presents baptism as a regeneration, an incorporation into Christ, a renovation, a baptism in the Holy Spirit. Lampe has failed to account for the data furnished by the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Acts of the Apostles. The imposition of hands mentioned by St. Paul (Heb. 6, 2), coupled with baptism and clearly a rite of initiation, is considered as equivalent to the handshake with which a new member is received by the president of a modern society. The evidence of the Acts is artificially interpreted in terms of a missionary ordination, and then the evidence of the Fathers is explained as a misreading of the Acts.

If a genuine theological solution is to be achieved, it must respect the essential data of the problem. Here we are assured of two facts. Christian baptism is a baptism in the Holy Spirit, and confirmation is the rite which confers the Holy Spirit. If the theologian cannot reconcile and integrate these facts, then he has no alternative but to admit failure. But he cannot solve the problem by discarding evidence which cannot be forced into the artificial framework of his rigid logical system.¹⁷ The catholic theologian must break free from the dilemma which sets up a conflict between baptism and confirmation. The fact that the Spirit is given in baptism, does not exclude a further gift of the Spirit in confirmation.

STRENGTH FOR THE COMBAT

The Council of Florence describes the relation between baptism and confirmation in these terms: by baptism we are spiritually reborn, by confirmation we grow in grace and are strengthened in faith.¹⁸ These ideas are reflected in catholic manuals of theology where we find that the effects of baptism are grouped around the concept of rebirth, while the effects of confirmation are phrased in the military language of the spiritual combat. Baptism is presented as the sacrament of

¹⁷Cfr. B. Botte, *B.T.A.M.*, T.VI (1952) n. 1630.

¹⁸*D.B.* 695.

regeneration, and confirmation is presented as the sacrament of strengthening, the sacrament which arms for conflict. This doctrine is clearly formulated in the Catechism of the Council of Trent where it is supported by the authority of Pope Melchiades. "Pope Melchiades has accurately evolved the difference between baptism and confirmation writing as follows: In baptism man is enlisted into the service, in confirmation he is equipped for battle; at the baptismal font the Holy Ghost imparts fulness to accomplish innocence, but in confirmation he ministers perfection to grace; in baptism we are regenerated unto life, after baptism we are fortified for combat; in baptism we are cleansed, after baptism we are strengthened; regeneration of itself saves those who receive baptism in time of peace, confirmation arms and makes ready for conflicts."¹⁹

This text of Melchiades had been quoted with approval by all the great scholastics, including St. Thomas. It is interesting to note, too, that when Calvin wishes to reproduce the catholic doctrine on confirmation it is expressed in the terminology of Melchiades. "These greasers say that the Holy Spirit is given in Baptism for innocence and in Confirmation for the increase of graces; that in Baptism we are regenerated to life and in Confirmation we are armed for battle. So shameless are they that they thus deny that Baptism is altogether perfect without Confirmation."²⁰

There is little doubt that the Melchiades text has played a large part in the catholic theology of confirmation. The fact may be unpalatable, but we must recognise that the famous text is a forgery. Historians have traced the quotation back to its origins. In reality it is an extract from a homily on confirmation, delivered in the fifth century in the church of Gaul. This homily on Pentecost attracted the attention of that extremely successful forger of the ninth century, the Pseudo-Isidore, the author of the false decretals. He re-issued several lines of the sermon, transforming them into the statement of a fictitious Pope, Melchiades, who lived only in the fertile imagination of his creator. Thus the sermon of an unknown Gallican preacher was launched on its career as a papal document. It found its way into the famous decretals of Gratian.

¹⁹*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, English translation by J. McHugh and C. Callan, New York, 1945, p. 201-202.

²⁰Cited from G. Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in relation to Baptism*, Westminster, 1946, p. 33-34.

It was accepted by the Master of mediaeval theology, Peter Lombard, and was incorporated into the text book of the mediaeval schools. Henceforth the statement of Melchiades was an *authority*, frequently quoted in connection with the sacrament of confirmation.

On historical grounds the text of Melchiades must be classified as a forgery. But the historical question has become a theological question. Gregory Dix maintains that this text is the basis for the whole western mediaeval theology of confirmation. Thus the concept of confirmation which is still preserved in current manuals of theology is based on a worthless foundation.

In recent years catholic theologians have themselves expressed dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the classical theology of confirmation. One of the most outspoken critics is the oratorian theologian Pere Louis Bouyer. He rejects the notion of confirmation as the sacrament which confers a special force, a special strengthening for the spiritual combat. Without doubt he is considerably influenced by the thesis of Gregory Dix, rejecting the unorthodox conclusions of the anglican theologian, but correctly emphasising the unity of the rites of initiation in christian antiquity and agreeing that the Melchiades text has exercised a detrimental influence on catholic theology.²¹

This heightened interest in the sacrament of confirmation has produced some worth while results, not the least of which has been a return to the sources. Theologians have renewed their efforts to uncover the patristic doctrine of confirmation and so to determine more accurately the place that this mystery holds in the christian life. A speculative theology must be erected on the broad and secure foundations of scripture and tradition. Moreover there is a certain richness and breadth of vision in the patristic expositions which are somehow lost when the brief and technical scholastic formulas are divorced from the living tradition from which they originate. In the course of future articles we hope to draw attention to, at least, some of the great patristic themes and show how they throw light on the mystery of confirmation. (to be continued)

C. TIERNEY

St. Patrick's College, Manly

²¹L. Bouyer, *La signification de la Confirmation: La Vie Spirituelle*, Supplement, 29 (1954), pp. 162-179.

The Date Of The Last Supper: A New Hypothesis, III

It was natural that the chief criticisms of Jaubert's hypothesis would concern her application of the 'sacerdotal' calendar to the story of the Passion in the four Gospels. One might be impressed by an array of Patristic witnesses, though in point of fact these belong to one isolated strand of tradition and circulated in regions of Jewish-Christian origin or influence,¹ or intimidated by an argument that seems to run from the Pentateuch through the apocryphal books and into the library of Qumran. But once she took up her position on the field of the Gospels Mlle. Jaubert had stepped, so to speak, out of the forbidding jungle whose labyrinthine ways could be trod with safety only by the specialist or with the help of a guide, into the plains which Christians had been traversing for two millennia, and rearranging the steps of a Via Crucis that had been savoured in prayer and the liturgy, the way that led from Gethsemani to the priests and Pilate and Herod and Calvary. Artillery so far silent for lack of a clearly discernible target now opened up to concentrate its thunder on a number of points of a path that Christians knew like the back of their hand.

To save us from over-hasty and ill-informed criticism, it will be as well to consider first the formation of the Gospel tradition and the materials it contains. If we devote a considerable amount of space to this it is not merely because of its necessity in our later detailed criticism, but because, independently of the subject we are now concerned with, it is indispensable for a deeper understanding of the Gospels.

¹Since our last instalment resistance has stiffened in this sector. R. F. McDonald, S.J., in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* CXL (1959) 79-92, 168-181, questions Jaubert's use of the Syriac version of the Didascalia, for the Ethiopic version not only has no mention of the Tuesday tradition but a definite mention of Thursday as the day of the Last Supper. Victorinus, too, is 'highly allegorical' in the section of *De Fabrica Mundi* used by Jaubert. Father Max Zerwick, S.J., professor of New Testament exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, corrects her interpretation of the Didascalia, eliminating an opposition between primitive Christianity *sic et simpliciter* and 'official' Judaism. Nonetheless the first agrees that she has presented 'a good case,' and the latter that it is difficult not to see a liturgical continuity. (*Biblica*, 39, (1958), 508-512). The criticisms of Benoit already mentioned are the most thorough.

I. The Written Gospels and Earlier Oral Tradition

(a) The Formation of the Canonical Gospels²

Our canonical Gospels are the outcome of a complex process which commenced in the primitive Christian community with the oral circulation of their separate elements. Their authors had available material of many forms, both oral and written. Already for some decades accounts of various incidents and sayings were in circulation which they incorporated into their text. Although they drew on a common oral tradition and share much of their material, some sources were available to one rather than to others. St. Mark could draw on the reminiscences of St. Peter. St. Luke could draw on Philip, on written sources, he could gather golden material from Mary herself, enriching the bare facts of Christ's Infancy with the theological significance perceived in them in the years they had remained 'stored up in her heart.' The Greek Gospel of St. Matthew draws on the first-hand knowledge of the apostle, just as the Fourth Gospel rests on the testimony of the beloved disciple.³

Apart from the fact that they draw on the same traditions there is a literary interdependence between the Synoptic Gospels. It must be admitted that the intricacies of the Synoptic Problem rarely strike a responsive chord in the student heart, but the fact remains that a knowledge of its broad outlines is important.⁴ Only by comparing the manner in which the different evangelists handle their common material can we appreciate that there is a difference of view-point and a theology personal to each. To summarise briefly the ground on which the scholars agree:

²The best up-to-date summary is to be found in the *Bible de Jerusalem*, Paris, 1956, in the introduction to the Synoptic Gospels written by P. Benoit, O.P. The frequency with which his name recurs in the following pages is sure testimony to our dependence on him, and some indication of the position he occupies in Catholic New Testament studies, both as to general principles and also to their application on detailed topics.

Cf. also L. Cerfaux, *La Voix Vivante de l'Evangile*, Tournai-Paris, 1946. Vincent T. O'Keefe, S.J., *Towards Understanding the Gospels*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXI (1959), 171-189.

Of the non-Catholic studies the best readily available is Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, London, 1949.

³Cf. D. Mollat, S.J., in the *Bible de Jerusalem*, p. 1396.

⁴The Synoptic Problem, dormant for some time, took on a new lease of life with the publication of *Le Probleme Synoptique*, by L. Vaganay (Tournai, 1954). Its present position has been summarised by F. J. McCool, S.J., in *Theological Studies*, XVII (1956), 459-493, and X. Leon-Dufour, S.J., in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XLII (1954), 549-576.

"Mark is the earliest of the canonical Gospels. Matthew and Luke are independent of one another, but depend to some extent on Mark. Whatever connection is affirmed between canonical Matthew and the Aramaic Gospel of the apostle, the canonical Gospel is not a mere translation of the Aramaic and is due to a Greek redactor. Oral tradition is recognised as a factor that exerted an influence at all stages of the formation of our written Gospels."⁵ Similarly St. Mark is far more than a stenographer copying St. Peter's catechesis.

Most of the material had already acquired a fixed form. Decades of oral repetition had handed down "the things that Jesus said and did," a selection of these was incorporated in the texts of our Gospels. Isolated units were knit into a consecutive account. These are easily detached from their present context and are understandable without reference to others. Most of the Sunday Gospels are cases in point. Often a group of similar stories are bunched together, instances of Christ's conflict with the Pharisees, discourses on similar subjects. In the Synoptics similar incidents are grouped by a vague phrase of transition, occasionally a story seems to occupy its present place by reason of a connection that is purely verbal with what precedes it.⁶

The Fourth Gospel must be excepted from these remarks. It is characterised by a remarkable unity, though it occasions problems of another nature in its presentation of the career and sayings of Christ.

The succession of events differs in the three Synoptics. As a particular instance consider the order of the temptations of Christ. This difference is even more marked when we compare the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics, not merely as regards one isolated episode, such as the expulsion of the vendors from the Temple, but even for their whole picture of the life of Christ. On the one hand we have one Pasch and the impression that Christ preached for only several months, on the other three Paschs obliging us to extend the ministry of Christ to two years and a half at least. This is only one instance of a healthy corrective supplied by the Fourth Gospel in matters of chronology.

⁵O'Keefe, *op. cit.*, 174.

⁶Cf. the connection of the separate sayings in Mk. 9, 47-49. Verse 48 is connected with v. 47 by the idea 'fire,' v. 49 with v. 48 by the idea 'salt.'

As P. Benoit⁷ has said, these are imposing facts, and they should ensure us from the dogmatic point of view of inspiration. The Holy Spirit has not wished to teach us with certitude a chronological order which His four interpreters present in different fashions. It is up to us to explain these divergences by the literary intentions of the sacred authors.⁸ If they have thus arranged and sometimes displaced the matter of the Gospel at will, it is because they were not bound by the tradition on this point. They found only detached accounts and introduced them into the order which best served their purpose.

In general, episodes are bound together by vague transitional phrases—'then,' 'again,' 'straightway,' 'at that time.' Not that these phrases are always devoid of chronological connection, the sabbath at Capharnaum reads like a real day (*Mk.*, I, 21-34). But other passages float without moorings. After the first day at Capharnaum Mark narrates the cure of a leper (I, 40-45). It seems to have happened as Jesus was leaving the town, but Matthew and Luke narrate it elsewhere, and in Mark it is connected with the preceding verses vaguely enough. Certain events, then, and series of events came down to the evangelists with their details of time and place fixed,⁹ while others had either lost them for ever or never had them. But this didn't bother the evangelists, they were not writing a modern biography, they were narrating incidents in the life of Christ for the lesson they contained.

On the other hand we cannot reduce the evangelists to mere copyists who sew together fragments of tradition into a patchwork quilt by adding a 'then' or a 'straightway.' Each has a unity of language and style which supposes a personal redaction. The tradition they drew on was still living, there were still eye-witnesses to whom they could have recourse to ascertain the

⁷Reflexions sur la 'Formgeschichtliche Methode,' *Revue Biblique*, LIII (1946), 481-512.

⁸This has been done for the story of the Transfiguration by A. Feuillet, *Les Perspectives propres a chaque evangeliste dans les recits de la Transfiguration*, *Biblica*, XXXIX (1958), 281-301. Cf. also A. Kenny, *The Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XIX, 1957, 444-452; A. Pelletier, *La Tradition Synoptique du Voile Dechire*, *RSR*, XLVI (1958), 161-180.

⁹One such series is the profession of faith at Caesarea Philippi, the conditions required by Christ of His followers, the Transfiguration, the cure of the epileptic, second prophecy of the Passion, episodes linked in the same manner by the Synoptics.

progress of events. Their general outline of the life of Christ is concordant, initial preaching in Galilee, the gradual hardening of the crowd, departure for the region of the north, Christ's teaching becoming more and more limited to the formation of the disciples, the growing revelation of His Messianic mission and approaching Passion. As for the Fourth Gospel, it gives us a historical and topographical framework of the first order.¹⁰

(b) *Nature and Evolution of Traditions Contained in the Gospels*

Much of the Gospel tradition, then, is community tradition edited by the evangelist, rather than a journalist's account of "what actually happened!" In the decades separating the written Gospels from the events these traditions evolved according to laws of their own, laws which have been elucidated by studies on the Old Testament, rabbinical and Hellenistic literature and epic poetry in general. If we are to understand the literary form of a given section of the Gospels we must take them into account.

To make narrative more interesting such stories pass from indirect to direct speech and add details which give colour to the story. Personages are individualised, words are placed in their mouths to make their sentiments clear, the same story reappears with different details. There are instances of these procedures in the Gospels which are hard to deny, in the Passion story itself. We don't have to deny the possibility of such a happening, for, as Pope Pius XII wrote, "Of the modes of expression which, among ancient peoples, and especially those of the East, human language used to express its thought, none is excluded from the Sacred Books, provided the way of speaking in no wise contradicts the holiness and truth of God."¹¹

The details of these stories are not affirmed for their own value. The full force of the author's assertion does not fall on them, they are a narrative or dramatic setting to assure that a lesson will be grasped or retained. But whether the rich person who questioned Christ on what was necessary to obtain eternal life was young (*Mt.* 19, 20), or of mature age (*Lk.* 18, 18-21); how many blind men there were at Jericho (*Mk.* 10, 46; *Mt.* 20, 30); or how many possessed persons at Gerasa (*Mk.* 5, 2; *Mt.* 8, 28), or Angels at the tomb (*Mk.* 16, 5; *Lk.* 24, 4)—this is of little importance, the evangelists diverge on these points, the

¹⁰Benoit, *Reflexions*.

¹¹Divino Afflante Spiritu, *Enchiridion Biblicum*, 559. Translated in *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, St. Meinrad's, Indiana, 1953, p. 98.

Holy Spirit has not wished to teach us these details. Divine inspiration works through the literary form of popular narrative as well as others.

(c) *Form-Criticism*¹²

The material classification of the different forms community tradition assumes is not difficult. They can be divided into two main categories, 'the things Jesus said and did,' sayings and deeds. Subdividing the first we can distinguish such categories as parables and allegories, eschatological and apocalyptic sayings, disciplinary sayings, maxims of wisdom and sayings of Our Lord about His person.¹³ Amongst the second are two notable classes, some with the briefest of introductions leading up to a memorable saying of Christ, and longer stories which multiply details, many of them miracle stories.¹⁴ More difficult to classify are narratives of the events of the life of Christ or His disciples. Here we should draw attention to a particular literary form, found in other parts of the Bible, which we cannot arbitrarily exclude as a possibility in the Gospels. It is what is called 'Midrash.' Its historical content varies. From a form in which there is no historic basis at all, and which consists of a story told to edify by an example of virtue or to sanction a law or for some other religious purpose, it passes to a form in which the significance of certain events is brought out by painting it in colours drawn from Old Testament incidents. In such cases it contains historic elements, but much of the account brings out its theological significance.¹⁵

¹²Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 22-26.

A. Robert, article 'Genre Littéraire' in *Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement*, V, 405-422, and in *Initiation Biblique*, Tournai, 1954, 324-327. The excesses of the radical form-critics have been criticised also by the dean of Catholic New Testament scholars, Mgr. L. Cerfaux, in articles, two of which are reprinted in the *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux*, Gembloux, 1954, vol. I, 354-385.

¹³The sub-division, which is that of Bultmann, one of the most radical of the form-critics, has this defect that it is not purely a literary one. "These distinctions are based on subject matter rather than form." (V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, p. 19).

¹⁴Mk. 2, 16f, Lk. 12, 13-15 are examples of the shorter form, Mk. 4, 36-40 of the longer.

¹⁵Cf. R. Bloch, art. Midrash, *DBS*, V, 405-422; R. Laurentin *Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II, Etudes Bibliques*, Paris 1957, who concludes from an analysis of the texts of the O.T. constantly utilised in St. Luke's Gospel of the Infancy that this is a typical case of the midrashic form. Rather than modern biography it is a reflection on the events of Christ's infancy bringing out their significance in the light of the O.T. Basically historical it is a 'religious history written in the biblical manner.' P. Benoit brings out a similar process in the stories of the death of Judas. We know this latter article only through a summary by Zerwick in *Verbum Domini*, XXXII (1954), 289f.

Since a study of comparable material in many sources points to constant artificial manners of expression, the form-critic tries to return to the primitive form of the tradition by removing the accretions due to repetition and the constant influences observable in similar oral traditions. He tries, that is, to get as close to "what really happened," as his literary means will allow. As with literary disciplines in general this will produce results of varying degrees of probability.¹⁶

Next the form-critic seeks to replace these deeds or sayings in the life of the primitive community, to discern the milieu from which they come, the purpose they served. This process need not be arbitrary, for we know a great deal about the primitive communities from other sources, the Acts and the Epistles. But where a radical critic talks of the primitive community having 'created' a certain story for its own purposes, we seek to find the reasons that explain why a certain story was selected from so many others for transmission.

In the process of oral transmission over decades the stories underwent a certain evolution. This is most noticeable with regard to the circumstances of time, place, persons,¹⁷ for the interest of the author was in what was said or done, and those details were unimportant. But there is more. The words of Christ themselves have undergone a development in the course of transmission. This development amounts to interpretation, adapting the sayings of Christ to the changing position of the Christian community.¹⁸ One of the important influences in this

¹⁶Abbot Butler remarks apropos of literary and historic criticism, "There is little finality in such critical work and we shall presumably always be left with a central core of 'assured results' surrounded by areas of diminishing assurance which shade off into complete uncertainty." (*Downside Review*, Spring, 1957, p. 118.)

¹⁷Cf. A. Legault, *An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee and Bethany*, CBQ, XVI (1954), 131-145.

¹⁸Apart from C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 3 ed., London, 1956, with instances from the parables, this process has been brought out in such works as J. Dupont, O.S.B., *Les Beatitudes*, Bruges and Louvain, 1954. Dom Dupont holds that in an original redaction (prior to canonical Matthew and Luke), the Kingdom of God was presented as the realisation of the Messianic promises. In Luke this truth is adapted to the position of the primitive Church, holding its possessions in common and subjected to persecution. Here the Kingdom of God is a just compensation for those who have no share in this world's goods. In Matthew Our Lord's words have become universalised, the poor 'in spirit' are not the socially poor but the humble and detached, those hungering after justice and being persecuted for its sake are those who seek after the ideal of the Gospels. Cf. also, D. M. Stanley, *From Kingdom to Church*, in *Th. St.*, XVI (1955), 1-29.

evolution was the early liturgy.¹⁹

Rather than the *ipsissima verba* of Christ then, we often have in the Gospels the application of His teaching to a particular situation. By the standards of modern history this would be regarded as tendentious in the extreme, but the evangelists had no qualms about placing these applications on the lips of their Master. In their attitude we can best appreciate the confidence of the early Church in the guidance of Christ's Spirit in interpreting and applying Christ's teaching.

No doubt we find this surprising, for we read these stories as moderns, interested in detail, background, time, place. It was not primarily to inform us of these things that the Gospel was written. We are much more interested in compositions of time and place than the evangelists. Certain it is that there are many episodes which can be explained only by a desire to know more about the life of Christ and the disciples, but an interest in biography as we know it was not the predominant motive in the formation of the Gospels.

2. The Passion Narrative

(a) Nature and Forms²⁰

It is generally admitted that the story of the Passion was one of the first to become current in the primitive community. The Passion story "as it appears in the Gospels has the nature of a connected historical account more than any other part of the tradition; this, in itself, suggests that the evangelists had access to a relatively fixed complex of stories. Again, apart from differences in certain respects, the Gospels are in substantial agreement as to the course of events."²¹ Other portions of the Gospel after separate circulation were welded into a logical or chronological unity, the story of the Passion from very early times circulated as a continuous account, commencing from the plot of the priests to put Christ to death, passing through a series of connected episodes to the Death and Burial of Christ, with some testimony to His Resurrection.

¹⁹Cf. David M. Stanley, S.J., 'Liturgical Influences on the Formation of the Four Gospels,' *CBQ*, XXI (1959), 24-38. R. Orlett, An Influence of the Early Liturgy upon the Emmaus Account, *ibid.*, 212-219.

²⁰K. H. Schelkle, *Die Passion Jesu*, Heidelberg, 1949, covers the whole of the N.T. teaching on the Passion, with an insistence on the forms the tradition takes. Cf. also Taylor, *Formation* 44-62, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 524-526, 653-664, and Delorme, *l'Ami du Clerge*, 1957, 230f.

²¹Taylor, *Formation*. 44f.

Did this Passion story assume different forms in different communities? That could well be. For though St. Matthew follows St. Mark closely, St. Luke seems to know another tradition some of whose traits overlap with material otherwise peculiar to St. John.²² The Fourth Gospel offers the greatest number of peculiarities, not only in details of fact, but above all in the point of view chosen by the writer. Literary criticism based on the comparison of the accounts, the known tendencies of the individual evangelists, gives a solid basis to some general conclusions we can retain concerning their genesis and their literary form.

(b) Origin of the Passion Narratives

The most important factor underlying the general unity of the four evangelists in the Passion narrative was a traditional Passion story in circulation from very early times. Such a narrative was called for by the situation of the early Christian community. Both for their own faith and for their conversion of their fellow Jews they had to be able to show how a Crucified Christ could be the Messiah, the subject of a message of salvation. The experience of St. Paul is sufficient testimony to their difficulty (*I Cor.* 1, 23). Only a continuous story could serve this purpose for only in the light of the Resurrection could they explain the crucifixion of the Messiah, and only in the light of the whole story could they answer the question, "If Christ was the Messiah, how did He come to be rejected by the chosen people?" A further factor in the production of such a unified tradition was the liturgical recitation of the Passion at the Eucharistic liturgy.²³

As might have been expected, authors differ in the extent they assign to that original tradition. Their reconstructions do not greatly affect us, though their unanimity, where obtainable, is particularly reassuring. Thus it is agreed that it was relatively short, and it can be assumed that the evangelists have built on it, incorporating into it material they had obtained from different sources. Superficially at least, St. Matthew and St. Luke seem to be adding matter to St. Mark. But even the Gospel of St.

²²To mention only two details, both mention Satan's entering into Judas (*J.* 13, 27; *Lk.* 22, 13); and the loss of the servant's right ear (*J.* 18, 10; *Lk.* 22, 50.)

²³Stanley, *Liturgical Influences.* 33f.

Mark has sections which can be isolated from their present context. Perhaps the most obvious instance is the anointing at Bethany, which cuts in two the story of the priests' plot and agreement with Judas. The account of the priests' plot is terse, with a minimum of detail. The anointing is different in form and terminates in a saying of Christ alluding to His death and burial. Previously a separate story, it was inserted at the beginning of the Passion narrative.²⁴

This is important from the point of view of chronology, for Jaubert's reconciliation of John's dating of the anointing with Mark's really reconciles nothing. Mark's "After two days was the Pasch" refers to the priests' plot, not to the anointing which was inserted at that point. Equally important is the story of the preparations for the Paschal meal, another insertion, and it, too, intimately connected with the date of the Last Supper.

(c) *Literary Form of These Narratives*²⁵

The Passion story in the Gospels is a historic account, it is based on real happenings. But interest is centred less on the details of the facts than their religious significance. Precise details of time and place are relatively more frequent than in the rest of the Gospels. But they are *a history of salvation*, planting the Cross in the spotlight of God's saving designs. Hence the frequent allusion to the Old Testament, and the way in which it is made clear that Christ, despite suffering and rejection, is the Messiah.

It is this doctrinal intention that directs the choice of episodes. Selected sayings will bring out Christ's foreknowledge of what He was to suffer and His willingness to suffer.²⁶ St. Matthew can underline Christ's Messiahship by paralleling his rejection, the price payed to Judas for his betrayal with that of the rejection of God and the price at which He was esteemed in Zacharias 11, 12. He can point to the real nature of the crucifixion by painting it in colours drawn from the prophets in their descriptions of the cosmic signs of the Day of the Lord.²⁷ Whatever historic foundation these pictures contain, their theological importance is certain. In the rejection of Christ, God has been

²⁴Such is the opinion of Benoit, Legault, Delorme who cites also Descamps, and Taylor.

²⁵Delorme, 231.

²⁶In such sayings as the prophecies of betrayal, the saying of Lk. 22, 15ff, and particularly in St. John.

²⁷Cf. Mt., 27, 45, 51 with Amos, 8, 9, Jerem., 4, 24, etc. Cf. note in *Bible de Jerusalem* on Amos 8, 9.

rejected, in His Death has come God's great intervention in human affairs.

Such an account does not call for perfect precision in details of topography and chronology. Incidents are abbreviated, details of the same incident differ in different evangelists. We need only point to the brevity of the trial before the Sanhedrin, the divergencies in the story of St. Peter's denials.

Disconcerting as this seems at first sight it is nonetheless a guarantee of the authenticity of the story. In later times the apocryphal books of the New Testament period would set out to satisfy the curiosity and other interests of another generation with sayings of Christ directed to the Sanhedrin, to Pilate, to Herod.²⁸ For the first Christians the bare outlines of the story were sufficient. One Protestant scholar goes so far as to say that "if we were to discover to-day a papyrus which would satisfy all the curiosity of the historian, which would give a legal account of the trial of Christ, and a report of his execution, then such a text would be suspect from the outset of not coming from the most ancient communities, for they were not interested in annals or legal accounts edited for the use of future generations."

In discussing the chronology of the Passion, then, it must be borne in mind that we are interesting ourselves in something that was not of primary importance for the sacred writers. There is a real historical problem and it is this: Is the interpretation the Gospels give to the Passion of Christ that which Christ Himself gave to it? On this question there can be no room for doubt. For if the Passion stories of the four evangelists are an interpretation of the events, this interpretation was central to their purpose, for this they received the assistance of divine inspiration. It was for this that they wrote. But outside this central question there is room for hypotheses, and it is the details of one such hypothesis to which we must now turn. Our conclusions will have no more certainty than the force of the arguments of the human discipline of exegesis, unconfirmed in such a secondary matter by the teaching authority of the Church.

JEROME CROWE, C.P.

St. Paul's Retreat, Urbrae, Mitcham, South Australia.

(To be concluded)

²⁸Instances are cited in Taylor, *Formation*, 46, and Schelkle, *passim*.

Moral Theology

OBLIGATION OF PASTOR TO ADMINISTER CONFIRMATION IN DANGER OF DEATH

Dear Rev. Sir,

A dying person has never been confirmed and it is presumed that the parish priest has occasion to use his faculty to administer Confirmation in the case.

1. What obligation has the parish priest in question to use his faculty (a) *motu proprio*, (b) at the request of the dying person, (c) at the request of the parents of a dying child, and (d) at the request of a person other than the dying child's parents?

2. What degree of danger of death is supposed by the law giving the faculty to a priest to confirm? Must it be morally certain that death will follow?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY

1. The existence of an obligation incumbent on the parish priest to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation to a dying person would seem to be a conclusion from the principle that pastors of souls are bound in justice to administer the sacraments to those of their flock who explicitly or implicitly request them, within the bounds of reasonableness.

The obligation in justice referred to arises from the implied contract between the pastor and his people, that they will provide him with the means of livelihood and he, on his part, will use his sacerdotal powers to enable them to receive the graces which Christ has ordained are to be granted by the ministry of His priests. Among the means of grace left us by our Lord are the Sacraments, which give grace *ex opere operato* to those who place no obstacle in its way. The parish priest, therefore, must administer the Sacraments to all who ask for them, unless the request is unreasonable in some particular circumstances.

The priest is the ordinary minister of four sacraments: Baptism, the Eucharist, Penance and Extreme Unction. His presence, with ordinary or delegated authority, is necessary also for the validity of the Marriage contract. A simple priest is not the ordinary minister of Confirmation, but in certain cases he

is empowered by law, or delegation from the Holy See, to administer it as the extraordinary minister. For the purposes of our present discussion, it matters not at all that the parish priest can confer Confirmation merely as the extraordinary minister. It suffices that he may administer it here and now, validly and lawfully, with the same profit to the recipient as if he were the ordinary minister of the Sacrament. He is the duly constituted instrument of Christ to confer Confirmation as efficaciously as he may administer, v.g., the Sacraments of Penance and Extreme Unction.

It may be asked what is the nature of the obligation of a pastor to administer the sacraments to his parishioners: is it grave or not? Towards his flock as a whole, he would seem to have a grave obligation to give them reasonable opportunities to receive the sacraments; and a parish priest who neglects this duty is guilty of grave dereliction. This would be true not only of the sacraments and spiritual ministrations in general, but of any particular sacrament. Thus, a priest who was assiduous in hearing confessions or visiting the sick and anointing them, but habitually made it difficult for parents to have their children baptised, would be far from being a faithful dispenser of the mysteries of God: he would be guilty of serious sin. The same may be said of the Sacrament of Confirmation. If it is more or less his practice not to use the sacred power entrusted to him, he falls seriously short of his pastoral obligations. In an isolated instance, if a priest were to refuse the sacraments to one who asked for them, it is usually held that he is not gravely wanting in his duty to the people, unless serious harm were to follow from the particular refusal. Serious harm would follow, if he declined to hear the confession of a person not renowned for an edifying life and now in danger of death, or if he did not anoint such a one who was unable to make a confession, because already unconscious. In each of these cases, the eternal salvation of a soul is at stake; and the parish priest would be evidently bound, both in justice and charity, to come to the assistance of the dying man. With regard to the sacraments on which salvation does not depend, it would not be, *per se*, a serious sin in an individual case to omit them, since the priest habitually cares for the good of his flock, and his denial of a particular sacrament is

not the occasion of the loss of a soul, though he has undoubtedly deprived it of additional graces here and of greater glory in heaven. Confirmation is not necessary for salvation. It does, nevertheless, give special graces, imprints the indelible character of Christian maturity and is a source of greater eternal glory. To refuse it even once, without good reason, would be sinful, but one hesitates to impose a grave obligation in a case where such is not clearly established.

(a) Should the priest make the first suggestion for administering Confirmation, or should he wait till he is asked? If the request does not come from the dying person, directly or through his friends or family, the reason may be that they are unaware of the advantages of Confirmation, or have not adverted to the fact that the priest may administer it to those in danger of death. One of the obligations of a pastor is to instruct his people and to teach them of the wonderful instruments of grace given us by our Lord in the Sacraments; and so he should tell those whom it concerns that it would be well for the sick person to be confirmed, and even to urge that he consent to receive Confirmation. Every priest who attends the sick (who are of age to receive Extreme Unction) would certainly feel bound to suggest that a patient in danger of death be anointed. Why should he not also feel bound to suggest that a dying person be confirmed? It must be admitted that the two cases are not exactly alike, as Extreme Unction was instituted as a help for the dying, and as the consummation of a Christian life, while Confirmation gives graces to profess the Faith with the vigour of full Christian maturity. Nevertheless, the parallel holds in so far as neither sacrament is necessary for one already in the state of grace, and both unite the soul more closely to God by charity, and give a title to greater glory. Extreme Unction is important for the dying person, as it cleanses the soul from the effects of sin and prepares it for entry in glory: Confirmation is also of no little consequence, for it completes the Christian initiation begun in Baptism, conforms the soul more perfectly to the image of Christ by the impression of the sacred character, which will remain for all eternity as a source of glory to God and blessedness for the soul on whom it has been imprinted. Undoubtedly, a parish priest should take the initiative, where necessary, and urge that the dying person be confirmed by himself, in the absence of a bishop.

(b) Once the dying person has expressed a wish to be confirmed, the parish priest should confirm him as soon as he can do so.

(c) A request from the parents of the dying child is the equivalent of a request from the child himself, as the parents are his natural guardians and have every right to seek the means of grace available to the members of Christ's Church, on behalf of their child.

(d) A request from another person has not the same legal weight as a similar request from the parents, but it gives the priest an opportunity to act as if he himself took the initiative. He should advise the parents of what may be done for their child and urge them to consent to his reception of the Sacrament of Confirmation.

When the Church granted to parish priests the faculty to administer Confirmation, as extraordinary ministers, in danger of death, she meant that faculty to be used for the good of souls and the glory of God. Once the conditions required by the law have been fulfilled, the parish priest, or other priest having similar faculties, cannot easily be excused if he neglects to confirm a dying person, whether adult or child.

2. The decree of the S. Congregation of Sacraments (14th September, 1946), issued by order of Pope Pius XII, gave to parish priests and others specially mentioned the faculty, to be exercised within the limits of their territory, to confirm the faithful who are really in danger of death through sickness, a danger from which it is foreseen they will die. (*Dummodo hi fideles ex gravi morbo in vero mortis periculo sint constituti, ex quo decessuri praevideantur.*) It is necessary: (a) that the person be in danger of death because of sickness; (b) that it be not merely a possible danger, but a real one; and (c) that death is prudently foreseen. The first two of these conditions are readily understood; and are verified whenever sickness is so serious that there is a likelihood that the patient will not recover. The concept of danger itself includes some probability, otherwise it would no longer be merely a danger of death, but a certainty of it. The addition of the following clause, *ex quo decessuri praevideantur*, would seem not to be a modification or restriction of the *danger of death*, but an emphasis on the need for real danger, not merely

some likelihood of it. If we were to understand that the faculty for Confirmation was not available except when death is the only possible outcome of the sickness, its use would be subject to all sorts of doubts and hesitation. The validity of the Sacrament depends on the presence of the danger of death, and it is not the intention of the Church to expose the sacraments to the risk of invalidity because of conditions which are not easily discernible. The answer to the question is: It is not necessary that the person in danger of death be so sick that death is morally certain; it is sufficient that he be really in danger, even though there be chances for his recovery. When that danger is present, the priest can discover from the opinion of the physician or from his own observation.

INFORMING THE SICK OF IMPENDING DEATH

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is there a strict duty to inform a dying patient of the fact that he is in danger of death? Upon whom would the duty devolve: the patient's relatives or the physician? What is the physician's duty should the relatives request that the patient be not informed of his condition?

MEDICUS.

REPLY

A patient in danger of death is entitled to know his condition, so that he may put his temporal and spiritual affairs in order. Unless he is aware of his plight already, or we can be morally certain that he is prepared for death, someone should tell him. The virtue of charity would urge that a fellow man be not permitted to go into eternity without warning. The virtue of piety would impose an additional obligation on his immediate relatives to see that he is provided with all helps to die at peace with God and man. The physician, being best qualified to know the state of the patient's condition, should take measures to ensure that he becomes aware of his approaching end. What precisely the doctor should do in this regard cannot be determined by a hard and fast rule. Normally, it will be sufficient to inform the relatives on whom the care of the sick man devolves; and this would most likely be the procedure followed in practice. If the relatives are not willing to perform this duty,

the doctor might suggest other alternatives to them, v.g., that they ask the patient's spiritual adviser to come to their aid in what seems a very delicate task. If all other means fail, he should tell the sick man himself.

The obligations of the physician, outside the purely medical aspects of the case, would be those of charity. Justice scarcely comes into consideration, since the implied contract between the doctor and the patient or family was to use medical skill to the best of his ability, not to give legal or spiritual advice. Charity does not urge to useless efforts or in the face of serious difficulties; and so the physician can be often excused from telling the patient on the ground that he foresees nothing will be done for the advantage of the sick person, even if he does know death is not far off, or because his 'interference' will be strongly resented.

If the relatives insist that the patient be not told he is dying, there would be an obligation on the physician to advise them energetically to see to the true interests of their charge. Beyond that, it does not seem that he is bound to go, as the relatives have it in their power to refuse him further access to the patient.

A few days should be sufficient warning of approaching death, and there is no reason to tell a patient who has a considerable time yet to live that his malady is fatal.

CASUS DE VITA CONIUGALI

Reginaldus, uxoratus et aliquatenus senescens, iam a pluribus mensibus animadvertit se in actu coniugali, propter aliquam incapacitatem, ad seminationem pervenire non posse: uxorem autem suam plenam satisfactionem ex orgasmo, tempore coniunctionis carnalis exorto, experiri. Statim post copulam sic attentatam et sine culpa ad perfectionem non adductam, aliqua tentatione ad pollutionem patitur et credit se posse, per seminis effusionem, completam sibi satisfactionem procurare.

Quaerit a Petro confessario suo num talis agendi modus sibi liceat. Confessarius anceps haeret, quia iuxta principia sana intelligit delectationem veneream directe quaesitam, etiam pro coniugatis, sine ordinatione ad copulam, illicitam esse. Ex altera autem parte, confessarius recordatur sententiam inter moralistas communem: licere nempe uxori, durante copula, frustratae, statim post viri recessum delectationem satisfactionemque sibi

procurare. Argumentando ex analogia, Petrus poenitenti suo Reginaldo respondet licere frustrationem, per pollutionem statim post copulam, remove.

Q. 1. Quaenam sint rationes cur uxori a moralistis permittatur se ad orgasmum statim post copulam excitare?

2. Quid de modo agendi Petri confessarii dicendum?

ANCEPS.

Responsum

1. Notandum in primis moralistas communiter docentes uxori frustratae licere statim post copulam orgasmum excitare clare supponere actum ex parte ipsius uxoris fuisse de se aptum ad prolem generandam, ipsamque semen a viro intra vaginam effusum recipisse. Rationes propter quas delectationem excitare post seminis susceptionem permittunt praecipue duae sunt:—

Primo quidem utrique coniugi, occasione actus coniugalis, ius competit delectationem et satisfactionem naturaliter actui concomitantes quaerere, eisdemque gaudere. Cum ad bona ex matrimonio provenientia tum vir tum uxor ius aequale habeat, uxor non debet aliquo bono privari quod a viro suo possidetur. Per seminationem vir satisfactionem delectationis venereae invenit et concupiscentiae remedium obtinet: quod omnino cum Creatoris dispositionibus convenit facultatem generandi hominibus concedentis. Optandum quidem est ut eodem tempore quo vir semen emittit uxor ad actus culmen per orgasmum perveniat, et sic simul cum viro naturalem satisfactionem, copula durante, experiatur. Aliquando autem accidit ut vir semen intra vaginam effundat ante sic dictam seminationem mulieris; semine vero semel effuso, carnaliter cum uxore coniunctus diutius manere physice non potest. Etsi actus sit naturaliter ad prolis generationem aptus, ipsa uxor privatur aliquo fine matrimonii, remedium nempe concupiscentiae; quod remedium, copula adhuc moraliter etsi non physice perdurante, id est statim post viri regressum, aliis mediis licite quaerere potest. Si enim vir ex copula perfecta suam satisfactionem obtinuit, quomodo haec uxori suas partes fideliter peragenti negari potest, cum, ut iam dictum est, ad iura matrimonialia quod attinet vir et uxor in pari conditione inveniantur. Insuper, uxor, quae ex congressu matrimoniali nullam satisfactionem naturalem

hauserit, a debito reddendo mox abhorrebit, cum sequelis infaustis non tantum quoad finem secundarium matrimonii, qui a neutro coniuge a debito abstinente obtinebitur, sed etiam quoad finem primum, qui est prolis generationem (et educationem); nam si a copula coniuges abstineant, vita maritalis perdurare stricte dici nequit; et certo certius finis eius primarius impossibilis evadit.

Alia ratio cur talis orgasmi excitatio uxori occasione copulae permittitur est ut generationi inserviat. Quanquam humor vaginalis ad conceptionem necessarius non censetur, ad conceptionem adiuvandam multum confert; et si habeatur, iter seminis usque ad situm ubi cum ovulo uniri possit facilius redditur.

Per seminationem igitur mulieris, ipsi remedium concupiscentiae suppeditatur et simul prolis generationi consulitur. Si naturaliter, tempore coniunctionis carnalis, non obveniat, licet illam procurare per actum tam intime cum copula perfecta connexum, ut moraliter a copula non distinguatur, sed potius eius complementum haberi debeat.

Notandum etiam quod si uxor ad orgasmum perveniat ante viri seminationem, delectatione concomitante licite fruatur, etsi, per accidens et citra uxoris intentionem, vir, sive culpabiliter sive inculpabiliter, intra vaginam semen non deponat. A parte enim uxoris, tempore delectationis, ipsa actum adhuc ad generandum aptum perficiebat.

2. Petrus confessarius poenitenti suo Reginaldo consilium verum non dedit, nam ius ad delectationem veneream restringitur ad actus qui quodam modo, directe vel indirecte, ad copulam de se aptam ad generandum diriguntur. Actus autem de se aptus ad generandum, a parte viri triplex elementum includit: erectionem, penetrationem vaginae uxoris et seminationem ibidem peractam. Ex quibus duo priora elementa sunt quasi media ad tertium, quod est copulae perfectio. Quodsi ex quacumque causa seminatio intra vaginam locum non habeat, copula perfecta dici nullatenus potest, sed ad maximum copula attentata, vel, si de industria semen extra vaginam effundatur, vocatur copula abrupta. Copula autem, de qua nunc in casu, est attentata; et quidquid sit de intentione viri de facto manet actus ad procreandum ineptus. (A parte mulieris requiritur ut semen recipiat sive cum delectatione venerea naturaliter concomitante,

sive sine tali delectatione, ex quocumque defectu non oborta.)

Iam vero, in casu Reginaldi, actus communis cum uxore aptus esse ad generandum cessavit, quando se retractavit. Ex illo momento non amplius actum coniugalem peragere persistebat. Seminatio postea voluntarie procurata ad generationem nullo modo ordinatur nec ordinari potest; est quidem et manet simplex pollutio, quae, ex lege naturae, directe quaesita absolute omnibus tum coniugatis tum solutis prohibetur.

Analogia inter mulieriem satisfactionem immediate post copulam quaerentem et virum sese polluentem non verificatur. In primo enim casu, habetur actus aptus ad generandum cum quo adiungitur titulus ad delectationem veneream; in altero autem casu, actus est contra naturam et unum finem, solam delectationem, habet.

COMPETENCY OF THE STATE TO DETERMINE MARRIAGE CASES

Dear Rev. Sir,

In view of the Bill at present before the House of Representatives of the Federal Parliament for an Act to be known as the "Matrimonial Causes Act 1959," would you kindly insert a short note in the "Record" explaining what competency the Parliament has to make laws governing Marriage.

INDOCTUS.

REPLY

Marriage is a contract originating a state of life founded in the law of nature. Every marriage, therefore, must be governed by the precepts of the natural law. Our divine Lord raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament, one of the seven efficacious signs of grace which he left to the care of his Church for the sanctification and salvation of souls. When the contracting parties are Christians, their marriage contract is *eo ipso* a sacrament, and as such comes under the authority of the Church. The marriage of baptised persons is regulated not only by the divine law, but also by canon law, with due regard to the competency of the civil authority concerning the purely civil effects of the marriage (can. 1016.).

Marriages between unbaptised persons are not governed by the canon law, since the contracting parties are not subjects of

the Church. It is generally admitted that the civil authority has power to make laws concerning such marriages, and thus determine the natural and divine law more precisely with a view to securing the common good of society. Any regulations emanating from the civil power at variance with the laws of nature or the divine positive law, to which all men are subject, would be invalid. The origin of this power over marriage which is enjoyed by the civil authority is not clear. Some would derive it from the law of nature, since marriage is a natural contract, and civil rulers have an obligation from the same natural law to care for the general good of their subjects. Others would confer on the civil power a God-given authority to regulate even sacred matters, when the citizens have no religious superiors constituted by positive divine intervention. Most probably, however, it falls to the civil power to make some laws for non-baptised subjects concerning marriage, for the reason that, in defect of a religious authority, the power to regulate marriage for persons who are not subject to any other human superiors devolves of sheer necessity on the civil government. Marriage is a sacred contract, even under the law of nature, and the civil ruler as such has no strict right over things sacred.

Marriage between a baptised person and one who is not baptised is subject to the power of the Church because one of the parties is her subject.

With regard to all marriages, where one at least of the contracting parties is baptised, the civil power has no competency, except for the purely civil effects of the marriage. It cannot determine impediments, nor demand a form of celebration of marriage on which the validity of the contract depends. It can, however, insist that the marriage be duly inscribed in the civil registers, as this is necessary for the good ordering of society even in civil affairs. If the civil power is to give marriage the protection it must have, no one could reasonably object that the marriage be entered in the public records. To make sure that none but an authorised priest assist at the marriage, it may also require that the names of all such priests be submitted and recorded in its archives. The civil effects of marriage which properly belong to the *forum civile* include the determination of the rights of inheritance to paternal property, proper support of children, and the standard of education in secular subjects

required for the well-being of society as it is at present constituted, etc.

Marriage cases, where baptised persons are concerned, belong by proper and exclusive right to the ecclesiastical judge (can. 1960). Cases which principally concern the merely civil effects of marriage belong to the civil magistrate; but if they occur only incidentally and are only accessory to a case on the validity or licitness of marriage, the ecclesiastical judge is competent to decide these cases (can. 1961).

An action in the civil courts concerning Nullity of Marriage, Judicial Separation, and Restitution of Conjugal Rights is really an infringement on the rights of the Church. However, to give effect in the civil sphere to judgments on such matters delivered in the ecclesiastical courts, it may be lawful to submit the case to the civil tribunal with the consent of the ecclesiastical superiors and under conditions laid down by them (cf. Concil. Plen. IV. decc. 472, 473).

Matrimonial cases of the nature just referred to may be heard in the civil courts, when the parties are both unbaptised. The sentence pronounced has effect in conscience, provided it does not transgress the natural law.

Any law which disregards the essential properties of marriage is invalid; and a sentence given in pursuance of such a law is likewise invalid. The essential properties of marriage are unity and indissolubility, both of which are somehow demanded by the very nature of marriage, at least for the proper fulfilment of the ends of matrimony—the procreation and education of children, which is the primary end; together with mutual help of man and woman, and an efficacious remedy for concupiscence, which are the secondary ends of marriage. The unity and indissolubility of the marriage are strengthened by the divine positive law and receive special confirmation from the Sacramental dignity of Christian marriage. It follows that a law which would permit polygamy would not make it permissible in conscience to have more than one wife.

Can marriage ever be dissolved? The answer must be given with some distinctions; but in no case is the civil authority competent to intervene. A Christian marriage, once consummated, can be dissolved by no human authority, civil or ecclesiastical. A Christian marriage, which has not been

consummated may be dissolved by the vicarious power which Christ left to his Vicar on earth. This power is exercised *ipso iure* by solemn religious profession, and in individual cases, for a grave reason, by dispensation of the supreme Pontiff to enter another marriage.

A marriage between two unbaptised persons (*matrimonium legitimum*) is dissolved in *favorem fidei* by virtue of the Pauline Privilege (or an extension of it), by contracting another marriage. To enter a discussion on the Pauline Privilege would be beyond the scope of the present answer, and our readers may revise their knowledge of the conditions under which it applies by reference to the standard text books.

What value, we may ask, has a decree of divorce in the civil courts? If the decree of dissolution covers a marriage which is *de facto* invalid, it gives civil recognition to what already exists, and frees the parties from any apparent matrimonial obligations they may seem to have had before the law of the land. A decree of dissolution, however, of a marriage which is valid—canonically for baptised persons, and according to the natural law as further determined by just civil enactments for parties not baptised—has no value in conscience. At most, it frees the parties from a fictional “civil bond,” removes the protection of civil law from their union, and clears them from the liability to an action for bigamy if they attempt another matrimonial alliance. At the same time it gives civil protection to the second union, with all the rights and privileges in civil law that belong properly only to a valid marriage.

There are many interesting aspects of the proposed “Matrimonial Causes Act,” but it may be more opportune to treat them on a future occasion, after the Bill has reached its final stages and, as it is not unreasonable to conjecture, has become part of the Commonwealth Law.

JAMES MADDEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Canon Law

SHOULD THE BAPTISMAL SPONSOR BY PROXY BE AWARE OF THIS—QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROXY—THE PROXY AND SPIRITUAL RELATIONSHIP—PRIEST AS THE PROXY FOR THE BAPTISMAL SPONSOR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

It sometimes happens that the parents of a child to be baptized desire to have as the sponsor a person who cannot be present for the baptism, and they arrange for this to take place by making use of a proxy.

(a) Is it necessary that the person who is being represented by proxy should be aware of this? Or would it be sufficient for the parents to nominate the proxy and inform the sponsor subsequently?

(b) What qualifications should be verified in the proxy?

(c) Does the proxy contract spiritual relationship with the person who is baptized?

(d) Can the priest himself who is the minister of the baptism also act as the proxy for the sponsor?

BAPTIZANS

REPLY

In the first place, it is legally permissible for a person to be sponsor at baptism by means of a proxy. Although it is true that the Code does not deal at any length with this matter, it certainly admits the possibility of such an eventuality when it states as a requirement for the validity of the office that the sponsor must "himself personally or *by proxy* physically hold or touch the person to be baptized . . ." (Canon 765, 5°).

FIRST QUESTION

Several reasons can be adduced for affirming that the answer to our correspondent's first query is that it is necessary that the person whom the parents desire to be the sponsor should first be informed of this fact before he is represented by a proxy. The first of these reasons is actually contained in another section of the canon already quoted in part; for canon 765, 1° states that in order that a person may act validly as

sponsor at a baptism he must "himself be baptized, be possessed of the use of reason, and have the intention of performing the office." It is clear that it would not be possible for a person to have the intention of discharging the office of sponsor if he himself was unaware that he had been chosen by the parents for this office. The proxy himself, of course, would be well aware of it, but it is rather a question of the personal intention of the person chosen as sponsor; this must be verified in the person so chosen, and the intention of the proxy, as also the intention of the parents, cannot substitute for it.

Another reason for our answer is founded on canon 769. This canon states: "By virtue of the office they have accepted (*ex suscepto munere*) it is the duty of sponsors to regard their spiritual child as perpetually entrusted to them, and, in those matters which have regard to his training in Christian living, to take diligent care that he shall show himself throughout his whole life to be what they had promised in the solemn ceremony he would be." Although it is of a rather general nature this canon does not leave any room for doubt that the sponsor at baptism does not perform a merely social function but assumes an office to which are attached grave obligations and responsibilities. Now it is a generally conceded principle that no one should be regarded as assuming such grave obligations unless at least two conditions are verified: (a) He should know that these obligations are connected to the office: (b) He should choose freely to accept the office with its obligations. From such considerations it must surely follow that a person cannot act as sponsor at a baptism by means of a proxy unless he both knew of this and gave his consent. Moreover, the very wording of the canon appears to suppose that such is the case; for in this canon the legislator uses the phrase, "*ex suscepto munere*," and it does not appear to be reading too much into those words to say that by them the legislator is equivalently requiring that the sponsor should have himself, personally and knowingly, accepted the office in the first place before he can be bound by the obligations mentioned in the canon, that is, before he can be regarded as a valid sponsor.

Yet another reason is founded on certain replies of Roman Congregations that are relevant to the point at issue. Thus, on

25th November, 1925, the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments issued an Instruction which was concerned with the matter of sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation. The occasion of the publication of this Instruction, however, is of the greatest importance in our present discussion since it related directly to the appointment of proxies for sponsors at baptism.

It appears that certain questions were submitted to this Sacred Congregation from the Archdiocese of Utrecht, and that these questions took their origin from a custom which existed in that Archdiocese concerning the appointment of proxies for baptismal sponsors. According to this prevailing custom the sponsor did not expressly nominate his proxy, but this nomination was left to the parents or minister. Certain questions concerning this practice and its implications were asked of the Sacred Congregation, and the following observations from the replies of this Sacred Congregation are most relevant to our correspondent's first query: (1) With regard to this custom the Sacred Congregation affirmed that the sponsor in this case acted validly and contracted the spiritual relationship with the baptized person provided he (the sponsor), possessing the other requisite qualifications, *knew of the custom and intended to conform to it*: (2) The Sacred Congregation, however, stated that the custom in question was to be reprobated, and among the reasons that it gave were the following: (a) It should always be a matter of unquestionable certainty before the Church *that the sponsor has accepted his obligations*, and under such a custom this remained uncertain: (b) The sponsor *should assume his office with full knowledge and conscience of the obligations which derive from canon 769*, and this seemed to be prevented by this custom which reduced the office of sponsor to a meaningless ceremony (29th July, 1925).

Even from these reasons given by the Sacred Congregation for reprobating the custom that existed in the Archdiocese of Utrecht it is sufficiently clear, as far as our correspondent's query is concerned, that the Sacred Congregation was in effect insisting that the person who is to act as sponsor by proxy must first be informed and must consent to be sponsor by proxy, acknowledging his willingness to assume the obligations of canon 769 in this way. And hence in the Instruction referred to

previously—and which followed the above replies of the same Congregation—these words are found: “. . . whenever in the conferring of the Sacrament some one plays the part of sponsor, not in his own name but in the name and by the authority of some other certain and determinate person, it is necessary that this authority or the will of the person giving the authority be lawfully proved, to wit, by qualified witnesses or by a legitimate document in writing, unless the intention of the person giving the authority is, from other sources, known with certainty and beyond doubt to the pastor of the person who is being baptised . . .” (cfr. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, vol. I, p. 342). And, in turn, this was in fact re-affirming a reply which had been given much earlier by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office which had stated: “No doubt a man may be sponsor at baptism by proxy, but for this the laws require that the absent person should himself first accept the office of sponsor and then give the other a commission to act for him. The reason is because a sponsor must have the formal intention of accepting and fulfilling as far as he can the duties connected with this office.”

SECOND QUESTION

The Code certainly sets down the conditions which must be verified in the sponsor in order to act validly (canon 765) and lawfully (canon 766), whether he acts in person or by proxy. But, with the exception of the brief reference in canon 765, 5° to the proxy for the baptismal sponsor, nothing is explicitly stated in the Code in regard to such a proxy. Hence, the law itself does not provide any information that has a direct bearing on our correspondent's second query. According to the law as it stands it is the actual sponsor who must fulfil the conditions of canons 765 and 766; and hence, while it would be most desirable that, as far as possible, those qualifications should also be verified in the proxy, it would seem beyond question that it cannot strictly be argued that the proxy must possess those qualifications.

It can be said, however, that the person chosen as proxy must obviously have at least sufficient knowledge to understand the nature of his own part in the function and thus know what he is doing; that is fundamental. Moreover, it seems to us that

it would be unlawful to employ a non-Catholic proxy, not only on account of the unbecomingness of a non-Catholic's assisting actively in the ceremonies of the administration of a Sacrament, but also and especially on account of the danger of scandal.

THIRD QUESTION

The Code itself is very explicit on this point. Canon 768 states: "Only the person baptizing and the sponsor contract with the baptized person the spiritual relationship which results from baptism." Thus, the person who acts as the sponsor's proxy does not contract the spiritual relationship which also constitutes a diriment impediment to marriage; rather, this relationship is contracted by the person whom he is representing and who alone is the *patrinus*.

FOURTH QUESTION

As far as this question is concerned it can be said that the law itself does not contain any ruling which has a direct bearing on the matter. Thus, while it is true that there is no provision of law which expressly permits the minister of baptism to act as proxy for the sponsor, it is also true that there is no provision of law which expressly prohibits such an action. Hence, it would seem that it would be possible and certainly valid for the priest administering baptism to perform also the function of proxy for the real sponsor. In fact, although the canons generally suppose that the minister of baptism will be distinct from the sponsor, there is no provision of law which expressly prohibits the minister of baptism from acting also as the real sponsor, so that even the priest-minister of baptism, in the assumption that he has the particular permission required by canon 766, 5^o, could perform this function; and consequently it would appear to be in the nature of an *a fortiori* conclusion that the priest-minister of baptism could also act as proxy for the real sponsor.

Without doubt, however, it would be far more preferable that another person, distinct from the priest-minister, should be chosen as the sponsor's proxy; and there surely would not be any grave inconvenience in the circumstances in being able to procure the services of another qualified person. In fact, we find it difficult to conceive of circumstances in which necessity

would be the justifying ground, and certainly it should be rejected as a customary practice or even as potentially such. After all, too, the identical difficulty can be urged in the case where a priest-minister would act as the sponsor's proxy that can be urged in the case where the priest would act as the actual sponsor, namely, that it would be most unbecoming and even open the way at least to a degree of ridicule that the priest should be speaking to himself; since, as actual sponsor or as proxy for the sponsor, this would be the effect if he must ask himself the questions and also answer them.

G. C. GALLEN

St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.

SHORT NOTICE

THE PRIMACY OF LOVE, Dr. August Adam. Mercier Press. 5/- sterling.

Having struggled through this rather ponderous treatise, one was not really sure of the point at issue. So I turned once again to the foreword by the author who pointed out that his first premise "that the word morality in the popular mind is identified with the question of sexual behaviour" was the subject to be discussed. I still doubt the accuracy of this premise. Dr. Adam certainly doesn't convince me, but he does with some conviction show that pulpit orators of earlier times did not restrict this word "morality" to its present so called significance. After the academic treatise there is a practical chapter called "Pastoral Deductions" which, if one is still in the mood to read on, is practical and thought provoking. Dr. Adam says he wrote down his thoughts mainly for his brother priests though he by no means rules out the possibility that they may prove serviceable in other learned circles, where he trusts they will be taken seriously. This at least tells us something about the author. Mercier Press does not make the matter any more attractive by presenting it in closely knit, poorly set out print, nor does the binding stand up to ordinary handling.

E.P.P.

Liturgy

SUPPLYING THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM AND EXTREME UNCTION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you please outline the procedure to be followed in supplying the ceremonies of the sacraments of Baptism and Extreme Unction?

SACERDOS

REPLY

The *Roman Ritual* (Tit. II, cap. 1, n. 3) distinguishes between solemn and private Baptism: 'When Baptism is administered with all the rites and ceremonies which are prescribed in this Ritual, it is called "solemn;" otherwise, "non-solemn" or "private."' The *Ritual* further determines that Baptism should be administered solemnly except in danger of death (n. 26). 'In danger of death Baptism may be administered privately. If the person who administers the sacrament is neither a priest nor deacon, he does merely those things that are necessary for the validity of Baptism. If he is a priest or deacon, and time permits, he also employs the ceremonies that follow the Baptism. Apart from the danger of death, the local Ordinary cannot permit private Baptism, save in the case of adult heretics who are baptized conditionally. The ceremonies which for any reason were omitted in the conferring of Baptism should be supplied in the church as soon as possible, except in the case of adult heretics who, with the permission of the local Ordinary, were baptized conditionally and privately, as above.' (n. 28.)

The ceremonies with which the Church has surrounded the matter and form of the sacraments are not necessary for the validity of the sacraments, but we are forbidden to omit them. The Catechism of the Council of Trent reminds us that the ceremonies of the sacramental rites stimulate a becoming reverence for the sacred rites, they display more fully the effects of the sacraments, and they excite acts of faith and charity in those who witness them. It is not surprising, then, that the Church insists on the supplying of the ceremonies omitted in case of necessity. A further indication of the importance which the Church attaches to the ceremonies is the permission which she grants for the use of the vernacular in order that the faithful

present at the rites may derive through a better understanding of the rites, greater benefit from them.

The procedure for Baptism is simple enough. The priest or deacon called to a hospital or home to baptize a person in danger of death, begins immediately with the matter and form of the sacrament, the pouring of the water and the accompanying form. Then if circumstances permit he should proceed to anoint the head with Chrism, and add the other parts at the end of the rite of Baptism. 'If circumstances permit' covers a variety of reasons, such as the time available, the condition of the person requiring immediate medical attention, the fact that the priest has not the Chrism with him, &c. It seems probable that if these concluding ceremonies were omitted even without sufficient cause, the minister would not be guilty of serious sin. At the same time there is no justification for the practice of omitting the ceremonies without more ado. The rubrics explicitly say that if time permits they should be added (cfr. *A.C.R.*, 1948, pp. 138-142). The ceremonies that precede the actual Baptism are never added in the private administration of the sacrament. When the person has recovered sufficiently to come to the church, the ceremonies should be supplied as soon as possible. The rite for the supplying of the ceremonies is contained in the Ritual, and will be found to differ very little from the ordinary rite of Infant Baptism. The text of some prayers is slightly changed, the matter and form of the sacrament are not repeated, nor are the ceremonies that follow it, if these have been already performed by the priest or deacon who administered the private Baptism.

In regard to the sacrament of Extreme Unction, the *Roman Ritual* (Tit. VI, cap. 1) lays down the following rules for the omission of part of the ceremonies. 'If the person is at the point of death, and there is a danger that he will die before the anointings are finished, let him be anointed immediately beginning from the words: *Per istam sanctam Unctionem*, &c., as below. Then, if he is still alive, the prayers that were omitted should be said.' (n. 12). 'If it is doubtful whether the sick person is still alive, the anointing is continued with the recitation of the conditional form: *Si vivis, per istam sanctam Unctionem*, &c., as below.' (n. 13). 'In case of necessity one anointing on one sense, or more correctly on the forehead, suffices, with this shorter form: *Per istam sanctam Unctionem indulgeat*

tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti. Amen. But the obligation remains of supplying the individual anointings, as above (n. 12), when the danger ceases.' (n. 20).

The necessity that justifies the use of the single anointing may arise from the condition of the sick person, or on the part of the minister of the sacrament, e.g., the danger of contracting a contagious disease, or the necessity may come from the large number of people to be anointed, or from the danger of exposing the sacrament to irreverence. When this danger has ceased to exist, the remainder of the anointings are to be supplied *absolutely*, not conditionally. If the person is no longer in danger of death, the other anointings are obviously not supplied. But when the danger of death remains, the question arises as to what degree of continuity is required between the original single anointing and the other anointings to be supplied. As might be expected, the authors differ in their opinions on this matter, some endeavouring to determine the continuity in terms of time, e.g., within an hour, but others suggest that the continuing illness provides sufficient basis for the unity between the single anointing and the supplying of the others. This latter opinion seems to be well-founded and perfectly safe to follow in practice.

* * * * *

REMOVING SURPLUS OIL FROM BAPTISMAL FONT— INCENSATION OF FONT.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. In a discussion recently, I discovered that several *dignissimi* have the practice of absorbing or spooning off the oil in the Baptismal water a day or so after Holy Saturday. It is a grand idea for reasons of cleanliness but is it lawful?

2. On Holy Saturday the celebrant is directed at the Font: 'Then he incenses the Font.' There is no mention of 'Thure imposito.' The last time he has put incense in the thurible is just before the *Exsultet*—a long time to keep a thurible smoking. Does he put incense in the thurible at the font, or may he, speaking generally, put incense in the thurible at any time before incensing?

INOPS

REPLY

1. The reputation of our correspondent's worthy friends is not endangered, because a number of the approved authors allow the priest to remove the surplus oil from the baptismal font. O'Kane (*Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual*, Dublin, 1938, n. 164) says: 'A mucous film is soon formed on the surface of the font from the oils used in the benediction. This does not render the water unfit for use, but it may be removed according to Baruffaldi (Tit. iv. n. 10), without any injury or irreverence, just as the oil used in the consecration of a chalice. It may be removed with a little cotton, and burned or thrown into the sacrarium.' Dunne (*The Ritual Explained*, Westmorland, 6th edit., p. 29) observes that the oil and water 'cannot mingle in reality, but they can be diffused for at least a short time.' He then quotes with approval O'Kane's suggestion that when the oil afterwards rises to the surface it may be removed. A writer in the *Ephemerides liturgicae* (1944, p. 79), states that in order to prevent the baptismal water from becoming corrupt, it is advisable to use the oils rather sparingly in the rite of blessing, and then after a few weeks the film on the surface of the water may be removed with cotton wool or in some other way and burned. This advice is reproduced also in *Matters Liturgical* (New York, 1956, n. 344f.).

2. The rubrics of the Restored Order do not explicitly state that the celebrant should put incense into the thurible before the Baptismal water is carried in procession to the baptistery. The commentators, however, directed the celebrant to put incense into the thurible and bless it before the procession began, for the good reason that the thurifer had just come from the sacristy and there would be no incense in the thurible. This interpretation has since been confirmed by the *Ritus Simplex*, published by the Sacred Congregation of Rites in February, 1957, which directs the celebrant to put incense into the thurible and bless it before the procession begins (n. 51). The thurifer with his smoking censer leads the procession. O'Connell (*The Ceremonies of Holy Week*, London, 1957, p. 63, footnote 6) further suggests that after the celebrant has said the prayer at the font, 'incense is first put in if the censer is not smoking sufficiently.' This seems to be good reasoning, for an incensation without smoke scarcely fulfils the symbolism of the action. Likewise, commentators suggest

that during a procession of the Blessed Sacrament the thuribles should be recharged with incense from time to time by the M.C. or an acolyte.

* * * * *

MASS WITHOUT A SERVER

Dear Rev. Sir,

It occasionally happens that I have no one to answer my Mass even though there may be several people present in the church. In such a case what changes, if any, should I make in the prayers? For example, do I repeat the *Confiteor*?

RUSTICUS

REPLY

The *Ritus servandus* says that the Celebrant should himself say the *Kyrie-Christe* nine times if the server does not answer (iv. 2); and in the reply to the *Orate fratres*, he is directed to say: *Sacrificium de manibus meis* (vii. 7). The problem concerning the repetition of the *Confiteor* was solved by a reply of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, No. 3368 ad Ium (4th Sept., 1875). 'If a priest celebrates without a server, must he say the *Confiteor* twice before the Introit?' The reply was: No. Hence the priest says the *Confiteor* only once, and then *Misereatur nostri*. The other responses are made as they would normally be answered by a server.

* * * * *

RUBRIC AT BENEDICTION

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is there any ruling when the priest should ascend the altar to put the Lunette back in the Tabernacle at Benediction? Should he wait for the *Adoremus* to be sung?

L.B.P.

REPLY

There are no detailed rubrics in the liturgical books to cover this movement of the priest or deacon at Benediction. The *Altar Manual and Benedictionale* compiled by the Committee appointed by the IV Plenary Council gives the rules for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament (pp. 23-27). It says: 'The Divine Praises being finished, the priest, without any reverence, ascends to the

predella, places his hands on the altar, genuflects. . . . After the Divine Praises it is customary that the choir sing the *Adoremus in aeternum*, &c.;, with the Ps. *Laudate Dominum*.' From this it will be seen that the *Adoremus* is simply a chant introduced into the rite to cover the necessary actions of replacing the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle. Consequently the celebrant does not regulate his movements by the chant, apart from the bow during the *Gloria Patri*. He should then go up to the altar immediately after the Divine Praises. Following the same principle, the concluding directions are also logical: 'When the tabernacle door has been closed all stand and during the *Gloria Patri* bow the head profoundly. Then, if the priest is ready, a genuflection is made *in plano* and all return to the sacristy in the same order as they came.' There is no question of waiting until the choir has finished singing the psalm before leaving the sanctuary.

P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

TO MARRY WITH LOVE, Virginia and Louis Baldwin. Bruce. 40/9.

When one considers the lack nowadays of preparation for marriage and its increasing disastrous consequences, one must welcome a book such as this. The authors are parents of a family of five and so they speak from experience. Although written in a "happy go lucky" style, it loses nothing in the way of seriousness; its thought provoking content is presented in such a way that it will be acceptable. How many marriages would be happier and more successful if the parties were able to check up occasionally on their attributes or lack of them in their roles of husband and wife, and mother and father; how many couples forget that the very basis of a happy union is unselfishness, unmitigated love? Also how many couples don't want to be preached at over their failings, especially by their partners! This book discusses all the aspects of marriage in a friendly but frank way so that the reader feels equally friendly and, one hopes, accepting of the thoughts offered. One realises also that it is often the little things in life which count; one is reminded of Michelangelo saying that trifles make perfection and perfection is no trifle. Certainly this is true of marriage. This is a book which could be read with benefit both by engaged couples and parents.

M.McH.

Homiletics

EARLY CHRISTIAN HOMILETICS

2. ST. STEPHEN'S DEFENCE (ACTS 7. 2-53).

It is a tribute to the fervour of the early christians of Jerusalem that they won from the general populace such admiration as proved, eventually, to be a powerful source of protection. "They persevered with one accord, day by day, in the Temple worship, and, as they broke bread in this house or that, took their share of food with gladness and simplicity of heart, praising God and winning favour with all the people" (Acts 2. 46). And, although the Apostles were several times threatened, and scourged at least once, the authorities in general "let them go, not seeing how they could punish them, on account of the people, because all were glorifying God by reason of what had befallen" (Acts 4. 21). The Church, then, enjoyed several precious years of comparative peace.

That period was brought to an abrupt end by the affair of St. Stephen. Since most, if not all, of the first deacons were Jews from gentile lands, it was natural that they should attempt to propagate the new faith in those synagogues which had been built in Jerusalem for Greek speakers. Perhaps those audiences were quicker than their Palestinian compatriots to perceive the schismatic trends of the new sect; and it seems more than likely that Stephen and his confreres were less restrained in their words than the Apostles had been. A dispute arose in which we are told, "they were not able to resist the wisdom and the Spirit wherewith he spoke" (Acts 6. 10). Rumours were then launched and shortly public feeling had reached such a pitch that he was arraigned before the Council. The scene, as described by St. Luke, is most remarkable for its similarity to another trial which is even more familiar to us: the tribunal is the Jewish Sanhedrin, the charge is blasphemy, the false witnesses are there, and there is talk of destruction of the temple (Acts 6. 12-14). The first martyr bore witness to his Master in almost every detail of his death.

The modern reader is probably less surprised by the length of Stephen's defence, although it fills fifty verses of the Acts, than by its seeming irrelevance. Most of the oration is concerned with an outline of Old Testament history, from Abraham to David, and, even conceding that much of it is not as irrelevant as it may at first sight appear to be, it would be difficult indeed to relate every verse to Stephen's purpose. Yet, if the content of Apologetics is the same always, its form certainly changes. In the rabbinic schools of Jerusalem the historical material of the Old Testament was regarded as the indispensable core around which religious teaching must be arranged, and moral teaching, accordingly, was almost invariably presented against the background of some selected event of sacred history. St. Stephen, like St. Paul, may well have been a product of the rabbinic schools; or he may simply have been familiar with their methods. In either case it is quite certain that when he opened his defence with the story of Abraham's call by God, he evoked in his audience sentiments of satisfaction comparable to those which we experience when we hear a sermon on penance introduced by the parable of the Prodigal Son.

Stephen was charged with blasphemy on two counts, of which the first was his alleged disrespect in speaking of Moses and the Law. The first part of his speech (7. 2-16) is a brief resume of patriarchal history which has little apparent bearing on the charge. But there underlies this section, I think, a suggestion that God was truly God, and the Hebrews were truly His people, long before Moses or his Law; with the immediate implication that the Mosaic legislation had no more than a relative value. When Moses is mentioned later in the discourse he is clearly treated as the heir to promises made long before his time, and, furthermore, this is not a unique instance of such Apologetics.

We know, from the reading of the Gospels, how legalistic in spirit was the Judaism of this period; it was due to that very spirit that the pharisees became the object of our Lord's severe condemnations. And this massive legal edifice which dominated Judaism rested, by rabbinic calculation, on the foundation of the Mosaic Law. It was natural that christian apologists, in their efforts to break through that spirit of legalism, should revert to the patriarchal period, in which they found abundant examples of God's blessings and promises independently of, and long prior

to, the Law. Thence they were able to proceed to the christian thesis, which we are ever inclined to forget, that the observance of law is not itself the essence of religion, but the expression, albeit necessary, of a faith enlivened by charity. "The just man shall live by faith" (Rom. 1. 17). So St. Stephen's reasoning here is an appropriate introduction to St. Paul's.

Yet, again like St. Paul, Stephen was far from admitting that the Jews could even look back on Moses without embarrassment. The drift of his argument emerges quite clearly in the central section of the discourse (vv. 17-43) which deals with Moses and the Law. By listing the privileges of the great law-giver—his providential preservation as a child, the vision in the burning bush, the exodus, the legislation of Sinai—Stephen presents Moses as the great prophet of God and the saviour of his people. But at the same time he stresses most firmly the fact that Moses was a prophet ignored and a saviour rejected. At his first attempt to help his people he found that "they understood not." Their ingratitude forced him to flee to Madian, and even after he had led them from Egypt they turned again to idolatry (vv. 39-41).

By this presentation of Moses as the rejected prophet, Stephen built up two arguments, both of which he confirmed by Scripture. Firstly, the Jews have no right to boast over a Law which, by and large, they failed to keep. The experience of Moses was not merely an isolated case, but indicative of the reception which God's blessings were to receive from His people. A fitting quotation from Amos summarizes that centuries-long history of infidelity which stretched from Sinai to the Babylonian exile: "Why ye took with you the tent of Moloch, and the star-god Rompha, even the images which ye made to worship them; and I shall remove you beyond Babylon" (v. 43). Secondly, in this figure of Moses, the rejected saviour, Stephen saw a type of Christ. In the passage which he quoted from Deuteronomy to support this claim, the primary reference is to the line of prophets who would succeed Moses among the Hebrews, but it found its perfect fulfilment only in Christ: "God will raise you up a prophet among your brethren, even as he raised me up" (v. 37). Probably Stephen completed the passage, as Luke had already done elsewhere in the Acts: "To him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall say to you. And it shall be that every

soul that hearkeneth not to that prophet shall be exterminated from among the people" (Acts 3. 22-23).

The second count on which Stephen was charged with blasphemy concerned the temple: he had claimed that "this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place" (6. 14). At several points in Hebrew history it is possible to discern a superstitious tone in the attitude to the temple. Jeremiah, for example, had reprimanded the people for the false sense of security which they derived from the temple (Jer. 7. 4. 8-10). It is understandable that amid the splendour of the new Herodian temple such ideas were again current. The temple was regarded not merely as God's dwelling place among His people, but as a security of protection against all adversaries. Hence the statements of Stephen, like those of our Lord before him, were understood as a blasphemous denial of Israel's prerogatives.

Stephen's answer to this charge is brief and to the point (vv. 44-50). He points out that in the centuries immediately after the time of Moses God dwelt among his people in a simple tent, while even during David's reign, a period always regarded by the Jews as ideal, there had been no temple, despite the monarch's desire to build one. Then, to crown his argument, he quotes from the last chapter of Isaiah a passage in which the author points out that God cannot be circumscribed by any building: "The heaven is my throne, and the earth the footstool of my feet; what manner of house shall ye build me, saith the Lord, or what shall be the place of my resting? Did not my hand make all this?" (v. 49). The temple then, like the Law, had a relative, not an absolute value.

"Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. . . . But Jesus was speaking of the temple of his body" (John 2. 19-21). In the Old Testament the temple was the guarantee of God's presence among His people, and I think we may legitimately regard the Incarnate Son of God as fulfilling this role in the New. By the Incarnation God became present among His people in a way which surpassed the temple by as much as the New Testament surpasses the Old, and other forms of His presence, as in the Eucharist and the Church, were born of the Incarnation.

The conclusion to St. Stephen's discourse is so hasty and violent (vv. 51-53) that we may regard these words as the final cries of one who saw his adversaries preparing to seize him.

They are well-chosen words. "Stiff-necked" was God's own description of His people at the time of the exodus; Jeremiah had used the term "uncircumcised in heart." The climax of the discourse comes in the last sentence: "And they killed those who proclaimed beforehand the coming of the just one, of whom now ye are become the betrayers and murderers, ye who have received the Law promulgated by angels, and have not kept it" (vv. 52-53).

In a later discourse of the Acts, St. Paul says that during this first persecution of the Church "I gave my vote against them" (26. 10). Since there is no reason to think that St. Paul, especially at such a comparatively young age, was actually a member of the venerable Sanhedrin, his "vote" probably means no more than his approval. He was probably among those who had unsuccessfully debated with Stephen, and he certainly looked on with approval at his martyrdom. There is nothing in the text of the Acts to suggest that he felt anything but satisfaction at the whole procedure.

This association of Stephen and Paul is a very happy one, for they were alike in many respects. In his interpretation of the Old Testament Stephen anticipated the teaching of the Epistles; the uncompromising and violent tone of his final words is very similar to the vigour often shown by Paul, for example, in the Epistle to the Galatians; then in the prayer of Stephen for his persecutors we hear that note of tenderness which was so marked in St. Paul. We like to think, also, that there was a further spiritual link between St. Stephen's martyrdom and St. Paul's conversion.

B. HEATHER.

St. Columba's College, Springwood.

Notes

In 1952 the Duquesne University Press of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, inaugurated a series of philosophical works with the translation from the Dutch of Dr. Andrew Van Melsen's study

of the history of the atom.¹ Since then several other volumes of the series have appeared, and among them are some that are of great value to anyone interested in Cosmology and in the rela-

tions between Science and Philosophy.² The latest volume of the series deals with the important question of the role of Thomistic Philosophy at the present day.³ Originally articles in *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* of 1951, which were reproduced in book form, the success of the work moved the author to revise the text completely and add some new chapters. One of the two translators of this revised edition is Dr. John Burnheim, formerly professor of Philosophy at St. Columba's College, Springwood, and now Rector of St. John's College within the University of Sydney. The translators are to be commended on the manner in which they have rendered the difficult technical phrases of modern French thought; they have succeeded in providing English readers with a most readable version. The importance of this work merits a summary in these pages.

OUTLINE OF EXISTENTIAL PHENOMENOLOGY

The term *phenomenology* from its origin means a view of reality as it appears to man; it designates a certain *style* of thinking, a certain manner of treating the age-old problems of the *philosophia perennis*. They are viewed from the privileged position of the philosopher himself, and the qualification *existential* stresses the fact that this philosophical mode is rooted in concrete human existence and is elaborated with a view to illuminating and guiding this existence. Its success—

¹*From Atomos to Atom*, by Andrew G. Van Melsen, D.Sc. Translated by Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp., S.T.D. Duquesne University Press, 1952.

²*The Philosophy of Nature*, by A. Van Melsen, 1953.

Philosophico-Scientific Problems, by P. Henry Van Laer, D.Sc., 1953.

The Philosophy of Science, Part One, Science in General, by P. Henry Van Laer, in collaboration with Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp., 1956.

³Volume Eight in the series: *Contemporary European Thought and Christian Faith*, by Albert Dondeyne, Ph.D., S.T.L. Translated by Ernan McMullin, Ph.D., and John Burnheim, Ph.D., 1958. Price 5 dollars.

for there is a growing number of thinkers who draw their inspiration from it—is due to the fact that it mirrors the situation of man to-day with his fears and hopes.

The universe is linked very closely with man. Even subjects seemingly independent of man, e.g. thermodynamics, depend upon him for their elaboration and form. There has been too frequently the tendency to reify reality, to think of it chiefly in terms of quantified things. Causality has been limited by some thinkers to the deterministic variety, excluding man's free action. One of the fundamental characteristics of existentialistic thought is to have recognized the inter-relation of metaphysics, noetics and philosophical anthropology.

The term *intentionality* is used by the phenomenologists to signify that our knowledge of the real depends on an experience of *presence*, which is interpreted as the coming together of a guiding intention (noesis) and an object (noema). Thus phenomenology is an inheritor of the tradition of moderate realism of the *philosophia perennis*. For it, as for Aristotle, Aquinas and Kant, human knowledge is a mixture of passivity and revealing spontaneity.

The humanism of the present day is characterized by its *historicity*. Man is more conscious than ever before of the great development that has taken place in the universe and in man himself. Scientists such as Lemaitre⁴ have pushed back the universe to a possible ten thousand million years and this earth of ours to between two and four thousand million years, while man himself is much more ancient than was once believed. He is conscious that he can shape the future, and this gives to humanism a powerful vitality. Man becomes very conscious of his temporal character, he realises that he exists for a short time only. He knows how greatly he depends on other men, and how much he is in communion with them. This is true even of men of the past; without Plato, St. Thomas, Kant and all the rest, the mystery of being would not be as keen as it is; the philosophical past helps to anchor us in the present. Human truth is an encounter; it is essentially finite, incomplete, and in a certain sense, provisory. For human evidence encounters the object in a single aspect which it takes up. The

⁴The *Primaeval Atom*, New York, 1951. His figures have come in for a good deal of serious questioning quite recently.

scientist realises that his is not a definitive knowledge; it is subject to continual revision. Even the philosopher has no privileged insight into the real. What is most fundamental in being (*prius quoad se*) is by no means always evident to us; it does not necessarily coincide with what is *prius quoad nos*.

It is at this point that Existentialism divides into two streams—the atheistic variety of such as Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, which is completely relativistic, and that of the open existentialists, Heidegger, Le Senne, Jaspers and Marcel. For these latter, truth is dependent on man's capacity to open himself to the mystery which underlies all being. When writers like Sartre or Merleau-Ponty declare that the existence of God is irreconcilable with the contingency of history and the autonomy of human freedom, what they have to say has nothing to do with the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the God of love preached by St. John. They are attacking a notion of their own making, an Absolute Knower reached on the basis of intellectualism or immanent dialectic. If God be revered as Word and Love, His co-existence with human liberty ceases to be an insoluble antinomy. For the function of the Word is to bring a message which will waken us to true liberty, and the function of the Spirit is to liberate us for love, since He cannot love without inspiring us to love in return.

Blondel, Cardinal Newman, Marcel and Jaspers set out to elaborate a philosophy of the Transcendent, which would take account of the whole of man, heart as well as mind, and yet avoid the twin dangers of subjectivism and fideism. Contemporary thought abandons the primacy of the concept and of knowledge, not in order to substitute for it a primacy of will or sentiment or faith, but rather a primacy of *existence*. This entails the recognition of existentialistic factors of a revelatory value: *anguish* in the face of death reveals other values than one's own pleasure; *despair* at having to live in a super-mechanized world; *failure* is the living witness to the fact that nothing here below can satisfy us; *consent*, i.e. the free choice of God, brings joy and peace.

CRITICAL JUDGMENT ON EXISTENTIALISM

Such is the general picture of Existentialism. What is to be our judgment on it? Its emphasis on the concrete is salutary, but objective knowledge is identified with the idealist or positivist conception of it. Existentialists make a concession to the *illusion*

of *immanence* by making the concept an entity in itself, a kind of representation or copy. Knowledge is treated as a poor relation, the danger of fideism is not satisfactorily avoided; it is forgotten that truth and value encompass each other, that *verum* and *bonum* are convertible. There is the danger, too, of destroying the value of the metaphysical proof for the existence of God, and relying instead upon some form of intuition of God.

Existentialism does avoid the extremes of traditional empiricism and intellectualism. It has brought philosophy to a sense of awe and mystery, and it gives a firm denial to monist conceptions of truth and being. Yet by affirming the primacy of perception, it runs the risk of falling into a new empiricism; and by over-insistence on the role of the subject in cognition, some forms of it lean too much towards an idealism of a Kantian kind.

THE RELEVANCE OF THOMISM

The Church condemns the two extremes, Rationalism which exaggerates the role of reason in our faith, and Fideism which minimizes it. Both of these restrict the field of truth over which the human mind can range, either by making faith unthinkable, or by denying the possibilities of a Christian humanism or of a solid theology. But the Church is not satisfied with simply denouncing what is incompatible with the demands of the Faith. That would be a rather negative approach. Reason has a positive role to play in safeguarding, developing and spreading the Faith; it is this that justifies the importance that the Church attaches to the Scholastic tradition, particularly to the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The oft-maligned Middle Ages were the cradle of Western civilization, and form the background of authentic European thought. The characteristic traits of the West are: an emphasis on the human person as an end in himself, the affirmation of liberty as the basic constituent of personality, the importance given to the body and to the earthly mission of man, and lastly the spiritual and personal conception of the Absolute. These are a legacy from the union of Greco-Roman thought with Christian theism and personalism. It is historically unforgivable to make European thought begin with Descartes. St. Thomas is the chief artificer of this synthesis of faith and reason. No philosophy has ever been so generous towards natural reason while staying so far removed from rationalism.

It is important to avoid conceiving Thomism in a rationalist or Cartesian, or more accurately a Wolffian, manner. Some manuals posit as the fundamentals: the principle of identity or non-contradiction, of sufficient reason, said to include those of causality and finality, and lastly the affirmation of the transcendental and analogical character of the concept of being. These principles are then interpreted quite apart from concrete reality; they end up as logical rules denied by nobody except perhaps by a few of the ancient Sophists. The original character of Thomism lies in a special way of justifying, elaborating and interpreting the content and meaning of these principles. For St. Thomas, the *primum notum quoad nos* is the concrete created order which surrounds us, and of which we form part; so all his proofs for the existence of God start out from sensible things. The particular material thing is, in its particularity, not subject to the human intelligence. The role of the intellect is to uncover the intelligible characteristics contained in what is sensible, thanks to the process of abstraction. Descartes expressed his amazement that the Scholastics claimed to demonstrate the existence of God, and at the same time held it as a maxim that there is nothing in the understanding which was not first in the senses, "where it is certain that the ideas of God or of the soul have never been."⁵ Descartes would be right if this maxim were to be taken literally. This St. Thomas never did. His doctrine of the *lumen naturale* and of the agent intellect represent an important qualification. The *natural light* is not just the power of abstraction or analysis; it is a light capable of somehow bringing with it a positive intelligible content, namely the *basic intelligibles*, being, oneness, truth and goodness with their corresponding principles. There is no question here of innate ideas, but rather of a virtual presence of the idea of being and of the ideas which are necessarily connected with it. This presence awakens to itself and becomes *knowledge* properly so called only through contact with the matter of sensation. The knowledge of the transcendental concepts and the first principles, so important to philosophy, does not come from sense experience alone. As St. Thomas says: "To know the primary intelligibles is an action which follows from one's being a man."⁶ These primary intelligibles are the imprint of the Divine Intellect on

⁵*Discours de la methode*, Part 4.

⁶*Summa Theologica*, I, q. 79, a. 5, ad 3.

our knowing faculty. However, our idea of being does not allow us to deduce the existence of God from it by mere analysis, as would say those, such as Descartes, who admit the ontological argument. The created world around us, the *primum notum*, is not a confused undifferentiated unity, but it presents to us an undeniable diversity of qualities. For St. Thomas, while the unity of being is in a way more fundamental and more primitive than the diversity of particular beings, nevertheless being understood as an enveloping and indeterminate unity ought not to be taken as a world distinct from and behind the diversity of particular beings. St. Thomas always opposed those who, in order to exalt the infinite perfection and omnipresence of God, tried to play down the existential autonomy of created being and deny it an *esse proprium*. ...“*Esse* is the perfection of perfections.”⁷ “*Esse* is more intimately present in a thing than the particular determinations it possesses.”⁸

The object at which the cognitive life is directed is reality, whatever it is and as it is, with all its aspects, possibilities and implications. St. Thomas expresses this by saying that the proper object of the understanding is being itself. The existentialists speak of the *world*, meaning our existential orbit. Such a view over-exalts perception, and being cannot be grasped by any one cognitive process taken separately. While the existentialists and St. Thomas stress the importance of *existence*, his is the broader view; for it includes the being of the transphenomenal order also. It is for him: “the act whence spring the fruitful operations thanks to which each subject progressively extends its conquest of nothingness, each according to its type of essence, with increasing liberty as one ascends the scale of beings.”⁹ Likewise, the notion of substance is wider than it is, e.g., for Descartes or Kant. It is the transphenomenal unity which is the ground of the series of manifestations of the existing thing; this unity is not situated beneath these manifestations but saturates and envelops them; it is a correlative with existence. It is characteristic of Thomistic existentialism that it does not separate essence and existence, nor make existence a useless repetition of essence; it gives existence a genuine primacy as the first intelligible; it is a philosophy of participation. The Thomist

⁷*De Potentia*, q. 7, a. 2, ad 2.

⁸*Comm. Lib. Sent.*, II, d. 1, q. 1, a. 4, solutio.

⁹E. Gilson, *L'Etre et l'Essence*, Paris, 1947, p. 309.

holds not only that form profoundly penetrates matter, but also that existence is penetrated by essence. The abyss created by Descartes between being and understanding has been bridged.

There is a belief among many Existentialists that the affirmation of God as the first truth and the ultimate foundation of truth cannot be reconciled with the historical and incomplete character of human knowledge. This belief would be justified if the idealist interpretation of being were the only true one. But it is without foundation if the affirmation of the existence of God is made in the context of a theory of knowledge such as we have just outlined. The affirmation of the Divine *Esse* does not cancel our *esse proprium*. We preserve our autonomy as creatures. The God of Thomist philosophy is a transcendent Creator who makes the world exist. As St. Thomas constantly repeats, to claim that God is the first source of being and truth in the ontological order (*quoad se*) does not mean that God is the proximate norm of partial and imperfect truths as far as we are concerned (*quoad nos*). Even if one takes account of supernatural revelation, the historical nature of our existence is left intact since God's order of grace and faith does not compete with that of the man of science or the philosopher. The greatness of the supernatural lies in God's constituting Himself God-for-us, the ultimate meaning of our existence.

Modern philosophy would be making a mistake were it to ignore the philosophy of the Middle Ages, just as modern Thomism would be unfaithful to the spirit of St. Thomas if it thought it could do without the contribution of modern thought. A living and contemporary Thomism is not something existing once and for all, but something always to be achieved.

THE LIFE OF FAITH AND THE FREEDOM OF ENQUIRY

There are some who think there must necessarily be a conflict between the Faith and civilization; for them, Christianity suppresses liberty and makes man a utensil; they look upon the Christian morality as a closed and negative one. Let us examine both the Faith and civilization.

The mystery to which we adhere by faith is at once a mystery of revelation, redemption and sanctification. Dogma is the noematic aspect of the Faith. The noetic aspect is not dogmatism, but faith, in the sense of having confidence in. The content of dogma extends over a wide field, and is grouped under various headings. It is the task of the theologian to purify

our knowledge by distinguishing the essentials from what is accidental.

The sense and structure of civilization. Man tends towards liberty; because he is embodied, his very liberation must take place by the aid of matter. The purpose of economic, social and political life is to improve relations among men, and to create the conditions that are most favourable to the exercise of freedom. Any genuine emancipation of man calls for three conditions: (1) Progress of positive science and industrial technique; (2) more genuine recognition of man by man; (3) the proper education of man so that he may show himself "open" to the highest values. It is useless to raise the wages of workers if they are not educated to use them well. Man is by essence a "worker-being"; it is on work that history rests. Work is not the mere producing of material wealth, but it is the activity by which man projects around him a human environment. The world of man is becoming more unified by better means of communication.

We may distinguish several domains of value: (1) Biological, i.e., that of values connected with life itself, and the goods necessary for life. (2) Cultural, i.e., the arts, etc., which deal with only particular manifestations of spiritual existence. (3) Moral values, i.e., the concrete and effective recognition of the dignity of the human person. This last division involves the recognition of certain values: (a) Respect for life and death. This is fundamentally important. The approach of death can enable us to see what is the true value of our life. The respect for life can easily atrophy, as we saw happen so frequently in the last war and its aftermath. (b) Love of truth and sincerity. An attack on truth is felt to be a crime against the dignity of the human person itself. The demagogue and the dictator are close to each other; they represent the triumph of untruthfulness, calumny and deceit; the best way of subjecting the masses to slavery is to hypnotize them. (c) Love, i.e., the attitude towards others which makes us treat them as ends in themselves. It takes many forms; we call it friendship, conjugal fidelity, the solicitude of parents for their children, charity. Fidelity and love are inseparable sentiments. A civilization which shows itself incapable of keeping them alive in the hearts of men is a humanism in decadence. Our civilization has shown itself dangerously indifferent to this value; such sacred things as the

family, conjugal fidelity and chastity have been so ridiculed in literature and on the screen that the sense of love has almost disappeared. It is at the very core of human personality; it is the refusal to treat the other person as an instrument of selfish pleasure to be discarded when one has no further use for it. (d) Liberty; freedom is not arbitrary caprice, nor is emancipation licence. Freedom and value are paired together, and true freedom, far from being opposed to the idea of duty, finds in it its highest expression. (e) Society; the constitution of a truly human society is also indispensable to human personality. Value is contagious; the scientist who keeps his science to himself has no true love of science. Man is open to universal values, hence it is natural for him to live in society. No society can be authentically human unless it has a moral basis, unless it rests on truth, justice and love. (4) Religious values. These differ from moral values. It is possible to have these latter without the former; for moral values depend on the realisation of my existence in its totality, of myself as an "I." It is possible to have a sense of duty and a recognition of the dignity of the human person without seeing God as the ultimate foundation of the moral order. The characteristic of religion is that it seeks communion with the Absolute. Religion will automatically be reflected in a civilization, even though it transcends it; it will constitute a domain of cultural values enveloping all the others; it rises above civilization, for its purpose is to bring us to God. Human existence is dominated by two fundamental orientations, being-to-the-world, and being-for-God. It is to the merit of phenomenology to have shown that to these two orientations correspond two worlds of meaning and value. There are varying relations between these worlds; they may either help or hinder one another.

Is it true that there is no longer a place for Christianity in a world dominated by a sense of being-in-history and by autonomous searching for truth? Quite the contrary, it is important for Christians to influence this world. Cardinal Suhard remarked that their greatest fault would be to leave the world to shape itself and to come to unity without them.¹⁰ There is then a delicate task for contemporary Christians. The Middle Ages are no guide, for Mediaeval Christendom was constituted by a sociological co-ordination of religious and civil power that is no

¹⁰*Essor ou declin de l'Eglise*, p. 53

longer possible. "Until the Renaissance, the intellectual history of Europe was only a chapter in the history of the Church."¹¹ The modern world is a lay world, organized under the banner of duality. It is difficult to achieve a true synthesis of the religious and the secular. The abuse of religious in the defence of secular interests is a dangerous temptation. Social conservatism bolstered up by representatives of the Church does great harm.

To the question: is faith compatible with the free search of the mind? it is not enough to answer that they must be because both come from God, the ultimate foundation of truth and value. The task is not unlike that of reconciling science and philosophy—the content of each must be examined. Revelation is essentially religious; it brings us light on man only indirectly. Science and culture have as their end to make us at home in the world and bring this world closer to us. So science can never make religion superfluous (Comte claimed it would) nor can a communistic regime do away with the need for religion. Conversely, there is no danger that religious faith lived in all its purity will disturb the work of mankind in search of cultural values. Christianity, through its elevated morality, has had a great influence on the secular history of the world. Faith gathers up all the elements of a secular and historical existence, giving them a new sense without weakening either their specific content or their historical structure. The life of faith is a communion with God. It cannot but give rise to a morality, i.e., the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity necessarily blossom forth into moral virtues supernaturalized by grace. We exist because God loves us; hence Christianity is a morality of love. Since it is based on love, it is a morality of the person; the dignity of the human person takes on a splendour without precedent in the history of civilization, for man is in communion with a personal God. Atheistic ideologies run the risk of reducing man to a handful of electrons. Christian morality is dynamic because based on love. There is nothing less negative than love. Thus the Christian view of justice cannot be reduced to the command: "Thou shalt not steal." It implies keeping on improving our attitude towards ownership, reviewing it as the occasion demands, and adapting it to the evolution of economic and cultural life. The moral life of a Christian is an effective value judgment. Being a

¹¹H. Pirenne, *Histoire de l'Europe*, Brussels, 1935, p. 393.

morality of virtues, the Christian ethic, more than any other, is essentially inventive, creative, and dependent on free choice. The central principle of Christian moral choice is an unchanging vision; it is a constant and effective recognition of the great dignity of every human person, taken not only as an end in himself, but also as a child of God, loved by God and called to possess Him. The task of the Christian is to discover God's plan, to accept it freely and promote the reign of charity.

Christendom, as a living communion of believers, is not merely an instrument in the hidden hand of God working for the salvation of the world. It is also a humanism, an original, intensely spiritual and personalist way, not only of conceiving human existence, but of accepting it, exercising it, and promoting it for oneself and others. The present civilization is dominated by technology; it needs a vigorous Christianity to provide the extension of the soul of which Bergson spoke. The Christian must not make his faith in the hereafter an alibi to dispense him from working here below to build a world more worthy of man. Nor must he consider his baptism as a diploma which frees him from the obligation of seeking truth in communion with others. Is it true that the Absolute kills humanism? In principle, certainly not; in practice, it all depends on ourselves. If our faith is truly a life in God, a living openness towards God, and through God towards man, Christianity cannot fail to express itself as a true humanism. Not that Christianity is first and foremost a humanity, but it is a humanity none the less.

There is need of a dialogue or exchange; Christians have no right to ignore or neglect contemporary views. The world is sick; we must study its malady; we must know, too, what among the natural aids will be of benefit. While denouncing error, Christianity must recognize the points of greatness of modern civilization. The Christian philosophy and theology of to-day must take account of the aspirations of the modern world and speak its language. Modern thought is important, not only for the apostolate among unbelievers, but for the enriching of the faith itself; so archaeology reveals a human world extending beyond our wildest dreams, giving ultimately a more magnificent picture of God's love for sinful humanity; so also psychology of to-day with its emphasis on the unconscious will finally shed fresh light on the central doctrines of grace, freedom and sin. Even error has its uses; it is much more a stimulus to reflection

than ignorance is; that is because of its link with the truth it hides and yet somehow indicates, as exemplified in the systems of Plato, Descartes, Spinoza or Kant.

The modern unbeliever will respect a religious belief only when it is consciously and willingly accepted and faithfully lived up to. The modern mind is insistent on its demand for sincerity and loyalty towards oneself and others—something that a Christian was always bound to. The Christian philosopher and theologian must be present everywhere in regions of intellectual conflict; he must not give the impression of dogmatism, but rather by his understanding, sincerity and fidelity show forth the truth in all its persuasive power.

F. A. MECHAM.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

*

*

*

*

*

When Michael Angelo had at long last finished his work on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, all Rome, we are told, flocked to see the result, recognizing a masterpiece and praising the artist. Life then was uncomplicated; the

SUBJECT FOR theologians, canonists, curialists and Roman
AN AUTHOR society were quite confident in their judgment; to-day they would require a

programme written in vague high-flown language to know if it were proper to praise the work of the artist. Art has become difficult. Mr. Norman Lindsay is always furious that art critics use the classic English of the past to explain the mysteries of 'modern art,' rather than the language of a Gertrude Stein, or a James Joyce. However, with the 'Anti-Novel' movement in France, you must hurry up before literature, too, becomes difficult.

Examine just for a moment a little field in literature, novels about priests (novels about nuns, too, are springing up around us, but we will leave them out of the picture this time). Priests have played a role in novels before—Balzac's *Cure de Tours*, the dry priest who disputed so badly with Homais in *Madame Bovary*, and further back all the mysterious figures dear to the Romantics. The modern style, however, is very different.¹ Who invented the present approach to the priest in fiction? Was it Bernanos or

¹Andre Blanchet has investigated the question in his learned essay, *Le Pretre dans le Roman D'Aujourd'hui* (Paris, 1955).

Greene? *The Diary of a Country Priest*, to my mind, is a difficult book, which in spite of frequent attempts to master and even after the film, remains something of a mystery. Take then for instance, Mauriac's fairly recent book, *The Lamb*, and you are plunged into a world that is full of amazement.² Here is a field for some young clerical enthusiast to examine; there is almost material enough for Ph.D. thesis. The priest, generally, is a diocesan priest, whereas in the old days novelists sought their models in the orders.³ It is, however, a backhanded compliment to the diocesan clergy. What is required now is an individual, wretched in many ways (Greene's Mexican priest, for example), who by suffering somehow in the end resembles the Man of Sorrow. Another established point appears to be that the priest is usually a curate, or, at any rate, a failure. The busy, efficient parish priest, admirable and successful in real life, has a poor press in literature, and a startling warning is given to parish priests in Beatrice Beck's book, *Leon Morin, Priest*, where a feeble, shadowy parish priest is reduced to ushering interesting penitents into the presence of the curate.⁴ Most of the priests depicted fall into two classes: the first, masterly in their knowledge of the workings of the human mind, quick to say: "Mademoiselle, the devil has possessed you," rapid to explain a fine point of exegesis (curiously the Abbe Morin in Beatrice Beck's book, though not surprisingly, does not follow the Vulgate's numbering of the psalms);⁵ quietly amused by the great ones of the clerical state. The second class consists of dead-beats and idiots, who by suffering and simplicity get things done that efficient organization would not touch.

²*The Lamb* opens with a prospective seminarian *en route* to the seminary. Sitting in a train, armed with *La Vie Spirituelle*, he witnesses a cold farewell between a young husband and wife. Of course, he never reaches the seminary as he is drawn into the domestic crisis. He appears to commit suicide at the end, but the evil young husband begins to pray. Mauriac's novel has been adapted by the eminent author for the stage successfully.

³And not so old. The reader may remember a German novel of the 1920's or 30's whose hero, a Jesuit, set out on a mission to Russia. After getting together his baggage, he had his appendix out although it was in good shape. Such a downy bird was not going to be caught in Tomsk by anaesthetic babblings.

⁴What a fall since the days of Canon Sheehan's formidable P.P's. who pulverised learned curates with peculiar views on the authorship of the Magnificat.

⁵Parish priests, however, will be quick to pick up Morin's mistake in the formula of absolution.

Monsignor Knox and Mr. Somerset Maugham devoted time and thought to the Detective Story: cannot we tempt some clerical writer to draw up a comprehensive picture of the priest in modern literature? To fit into the picture even *The Cardinal* (easy to read, but so horrible), *Don Camillo*, all Mr. Bruce Marshall's Scottish, French and Spanish priests who are so much alike (incidentally, it is those clerical types, with hair growing out of their ears, who are helping to pay for Mr. Bruce Marshall's Riviera home), the mealy-mouthed Monsignor of Mr. O'Connor's *Last Hurrah*, so obviously a climber, who would never say: "Madame, you are possessed by the devil." That is the interesting subject I leave to some enthusiastic searcher, and the field has been hardly scratched, as I hasten to read Mr. Bruce Marshall's latest book, hot from the press, *A Thread of Scarlet*.

T.V.

SHORT NOTICE

IDEALS TO LIVE BY—Some of the principles which moulded St. Ignatius Loyola—by Robert Nash, S.J. Dublin: Gill, 1958, Cr. 8vo, 175 pp. 8/6 sterling.

In his latest book on the Spiritual Life, Father Nash, with over 20 years' experience in giving missions and retreats, places before us some thoughts and meditations taken from the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola. Using, for the most part, the order found in the Exercises, he chooses various points and expands them in his typically clear and practical manner. He shows that though St. Ignatius wrote over 400 years ago, the solutions he gives solve the problems we face to-day.

The author's idea in writing was to make the Exercises, which so many have heard of, become more of a reality to our Catholic layfolk. The book is easily read, for though the author quotes often from his vast knowledge of spiritual authorities, all references to the sources have been omitted.

Some of the subjects which are treated are Prayer, Humility, the Passion, Christ's tears and His great Serenity. It is on the treatment of prayer where there is given an exhortation to Mental Prayer, and later a sample Meditation, that the book seems to be the most helpful.

The author did not set out to give a comprehensive commentary and study of the Exercises but to give food for thought to his reader, whom he hopes will make further inquiries for himself. This book could come in handy for any layman trying to grow closer to God and might even be used by priests in preparing retreat or mission conferences.

—B.F.C.

Book Reviews

GUIDE FOR RELIGIOUS ADMINISTRATORS, by Very Rev. Paul J. Hoffer, S.M., translated by Gabriel J. Rus, S.M. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company. Pp. 171. Price, 4.50 dollars, U.S.A.

In many Religious Congregations the constitutions have been recently revised, and the powers and duties of the local superior have been more defined. For such cases, and for all superiors of Religious, this book will be very useful.

The author, Very Reverend Father Paul Hoffer, S.M., is the Superior General of the Society of Mary. His office then gives him the practical experience of dealing with day-to-day problems, as well as of visiting the houses of his Congregation all over the world. He has a particular competence in school work, as, for many years before he was made Superior General he filled the post of Inspector of Schools in America.

There are four divisions of the work, treating of the superior's office as an administrator, as father of his community, as head of the school, and of his responsibility for the material welfare of the community. A number of suitable meditations for superiors is added.

One might question some details, for example, while a superior should not decide a dispute without hearing both sides, still it might be dangerous to have the disputants argue the case before him. Again, in the section on schools, the circumstances are those of the United States, and the directions would have to be accommodated to other conditions. But the advice given is marked by a high ideal of religious life and work, and by practical common sense. Father Hoffer strikes a nice balance between readiness to adapt oneself to modern needs and reverence for tradition.

To be a good religious superior is not easy, and one of the best means to form a superior is regular attention to the obligations of the office and examination of one's performance. A book of this kind would be a valuable aid for such regular consideration, and the Guide can be confidently recommended.

The book is excellently produced; there is a carefully compiled index. It is a pity that it could not have been produced at a more moderate price.

J.H.

* * * * *

THE LAPSED: THE UNITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH—ST. CYPRIAN; Ancient Christian Writers. Vol. XXV; translated and annotated by Maurice Bevenot, S.J., Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1957, p.p. 133, 21/-.

This present volume of the A.C.W. series of patristic writings

maintains the standard set by the earlier volumes. Here we have the same clearly printed volume, the scholarly and readable introduction (10 pages), the excellent translations of the texts (53 pages) and the copious notes and references (56 pages). This volume is completed by a detailed index of names and subjects (8 pages); an index of scriptural quotations would have been useful.

St. Cyprian's treatment in the "Lapsed," of those Christians who had apostasized in the persecution of Decius (A.D. 249) and who, now that the danger was past, made excuses for themselves "is a model of pastoral denunciation, combined with exhortation and encouragement to those who keenly felt the disgrace of their fall, or who shrank from the rigours of the Church's penance." The "Unity of the Catholic Church" is the earliest work on the subject that we have and in it we have a good example of what a dogma can look like while it is still in an early stage of development. Concerning the matter of the two recensions of Chapter IV, Bevenot, holds that the "Primacy Text is the original and that Cyprian himself revised it when he found out that his precise meaning was being misconstrued. Of course, Bevenot is an expert in this subject, as a glance at the number of of his works cited in the notes will show, as well as the evident scholarship of the work to hand. He rightly points out that apart from their historical and theological value, the two works of St. Cyprian are valuable evidence for the Christian life and thought of the period. St. Cyprian's love for Christ and the Church, as expressed in his writings, enables us to see something of the living Church in action in the middle of the third century. The two books make interesting and moving reading.

With regard to the notes—here will be found all the apparatus of the expert, with annotations on St. Cyprian's difficult Latin style. They are certainly heavy fare for the casual reader and perhaps overburden a production that does not include the Latin text. However, as they are relegated to the back of the book, they do not necessarily interrupt the reading of the texts and the reader would do well to leave reference to them until the second perusal.

P.F.M.

* * * * *

THE PROXIMATE AIM OF EDUCATION, by Kevin J. O'Brien, C.S.S.R., M.A., 1958; published by the Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 51/6.

At the moment in Australia the theory of education is coming into its own as a major force in school planning, and particularly under the stress of the manifold tensions distending the Catholic educational structure increasing attention is being directed to thought and scientific study.

As the author of this study writes on page 28: "If the end of Catholic education be overlooked or confused or lowered, the educational means naturally lose their full efficacy. In vain will we seek compensation in improved methods, better buildings and expensive audio-visuals."

This timely study of the aims of Education is the work of an Australian, carried out and printed in the U.S.A., an excellent case of lend-lease. Its architect, a Redemptorist, took his degree at the Catholic University of Washington.

However, there is nothing particularly Australian in it for its scope is universal, its treatment philosophical; and it is deep.

It does not make light reading. The circle to which it appeals in the first sections is limited to students of education as such and it presupposes a knowledge of scholastic philosophy. Indeed it serves as a valuable test of the residue remaining in the mind of a priest or student after years of non-philosophical meanderings in the affairs of the world. This reviewer had perforce to advance through its pages cautiously at a slow pace.

The foundations of its construction are dug deep in the philosophy of aim, end and causation and the effect of this thoroughness soon become apparent in the clear criticism of the theories dominant in American and Australian public education under the impetus of Dewey. This compendium of current theories with the analysis of strength and weakness is recommended to anyone wishing to discuss education in private or publicly.

This section takes up 72 pages. The presentation of the Catholic view goes on to page 196 and is complete. The third section of 50 pages is devoted to particular implications for education.

Here there is a useful harvest for all teachers in the discussion of the various practical decisions confronting teachers. What are the priorities in teaching, and the relationship of image training and mental build-up? What is the difference between paying service and lip-service to truth in teaching? What of daily Mass in schools? These are a few of the many topics well treated by the author.

Perhaps this study of methods might have been more complete if the theories advanced had been reinforced by evidence obtained from surveys of results. Do we rely too much on a priori arguments on educational matters rather than on results a posteriori?

—C.J.D.

PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE SERIES. Sheed and Ward, London, 1958. No. 1. *SCIENCE AND METAPHYSICS*, by John Russell, S.J., Ph.D., M.A. Price 2/6. No. 2. *LIFE AND ITS ORIGIN*, by Philip G. Fothergill, B.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E. Price 3/6. No. 3. *WHITEHEAD'S PHILOSOPHY OF PHYSICS*, by Laurence Bright, O.P., S.T.L., M.A., D.Phil. Price 2/6.

For some considerable time it had been a matter of regret that few works appeared from Neo-Scholastics devoted to Natural Philosophy. In the last few years this has been changed, and one sign of it is the activity of the Philosophy of Science Group of the English Newman Association. It is responsible for an excellent quarterly bulletin, which is obtainable in Australia for 10/- per year from John Hewitt, 46 Grandview St., Wagga. This same group has begun this Philosophy of Science series, edited by Dr. P. E. Hodgson of Oxford.

In the first of these booklets, Father Russell gives an excellent account of the provinces of both disciplines and shows them to be complementary. His summary of the role of metaphysics is well worthy of our notice.

Through metaphysics, we recognise the contingent nature of the things that exist around us. We cannot understand a particular contingent being without having some understanding of many such beings, which are its causes. A cause is an entity which helps to render another entity intelligible. The metaphysician, recognising the radical deficiency of contingent being, realises that the ultimate ground of intelligibility of contingent being can only be an actually existing necessary being. Hence, if contingent being exists, so also must necessary being. This is the basis of the metaphysical proof for the existence of God.

All men, including scientists, make use of metaphysical judgments, e.g., "different," "same," "cause," often without adverting to their significance. It is the function of the metaphysician to deepen and clarify an insight which is already there in germ. Every scientist is a human being, and as such ought not to be wholly indifferent to the total significance of his work, nor to the ultimate ground from which its intelligibility is derived.

Equally, on the other hand, the metaphysician ought not to be uninterested in the work of the scientist. The metaphysical structure of the world is highly abstract and gives no hint of the variety and richness of order which is discoverable in the universe at a more concrete level. The metaphysical and scientific accounts of the world are both incomplete; they need to be supplemented by each other and eventually integrated into a single whole.

One of the difficulties of metaphysics is that the relevant data is too familiar. We tend to suppose that if we know how to use a word, we know precisely what it means. Intellectual

discipline is required, hence metaphysics will never command the relatively universal assent given to many scientific propositions. The "scandal" of the multiplicity of metaphysical systems has this cause.

Analogous terms have a profound importance in metaphysics. Why is this? It is because this world was created by God and is a finite communication of His infinite perfection. It is impossible that any creature should show God forth perfectly or adequately. Since God's nature is one and simple, there must be a fundamental unity and similarity underlying the diversity of created things. This is the ultimate ground of the analogy of being, and would seem to be a fundamental and inescapable feature of any conceivable universe created by God.

In the second publication, Dr. Fothergill, an author and lecturer already well known in this field, gives a most interesting account of various theories on the nature of life. He discusses the old theory of the origin of life by spontaneous generation, shows how it was destroyed by Pasteur and Tyndall, yet has re-appeared in the guise of modern chemistry. Theories of the chemical origin of life stand or fall by this major assumption, namely that given the correct mixture of chemicals properly organized, life would automatically result. There is no evidence for this assumption.

The possibility of life on this earth being due to its having come from some other part of the universe is examined, and the conclusion reached that we must give up the idea that life germs floated towards our earth from the outside cosmic spaces. One of the most interesting parts of the treatise is that devoted to viruses. Apart from many interesting facts about them, e.g., that they vary in size between 10 millionth and 450 millionth of a millimetre, and the composition of our recurring enemy, the influenza virus, there is a full discussion of the question whether they are living beings or not, and if they are, whether they can be considered the precursors of life as fully developed.

This booklet is heartily recommended for its valuable scientific information, and especially for its clear analysis of the number and importance of the problems besetting biology regarding the fundamental concepts about life.

The last in the series, by Father Bright, is again a very useful analysis. It is his claim that Whitehead's philosophy of physics has been neglected and will one day be recognised for its worth. In this system of Whitehead's the distinction is made between causal efficacy and immediate presentation. This latter was the sole aspect considered by Hume, hence his refusal to admit causality.

Much more debatable is his central doctrine of internal relations. It contains ideas that will be much more acceptable than many current theories. While avoiding the use of the word "substance," he in effect admits its reality. Aristotle was not a philosopher to whom he felt drawn; (he characterized European

philosophy as a series of foot-notes to Plato) yet his doctrine of organism is reminiscent of the role that Aristotle outlined for substantial form.

Father Bright's championing of Whitehead's philosophy is another example of how Scholastics to-day are emphasising the active role of substance and in so doing are returning to true Aristotelian doctrine.

F.A.M.

*

*

*

*

*

CHRISTIANITY AND AMERICAN FREEMASONRY, by William J. Whalen, 1958. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, U.S.A., pp. VII and 195. Price: 3.75 dollars.

The majority of the world's Masons live in the United States and to-day one in every dozen American men is a Mason. This work is claimed to be the first full length treatment of the subject by an American Catholic in fifty years. The author pays tribute to the excellent books by English writers, *Darkness Visible* and *Christian by Degrees*, by Walton Hannah, now a Catholic priest, and *The Nature of Freemasonry* by Dr. Hubert S. Box, an Anglican. This work covers much of the same ground, but naturally expands the American picture. There is an interesting chapter on European Masonry, and Australia and New Zealand are credited with a total of 365,000 Masons, which is almost the American proportion to population.

The Church's condemnations of Freemasonry are examined in detail. It is made clear that apart from questions of anti-clericalism, anti-Catholic bias, and in European Grand Orient, of atheism, the fundamental reason for Christian opposition to all forms of Freemasonry must be because Jesus Christ is not recognised therein as the sole Mediator of Salvation. Examining also the other denominations of Christians, Protestant and Orthodox, the author shows that the majority of the world's Christians belong to communions which condemn the lodge for its religion of naturalism, its immoral oaths, and its anti-Christian activities.

American Freemasonry has descended to the lowest level of poor taste and general silliness in the Shrine ritual, which has no counterpart in English Masonry. In the ritual for this degree the candidate takes a blasphemous oath in the name of Allah, the god of Arab Moslem and Mohammedan, the god of our fathers. "Only Christians with a singular lack of historical sense and fitness would pattern a society after Christendom's ancient persecutors. Perhaps a hundred years from now a similar gathering of professed Christians will sport red hammers and sickles in their lapels and address each other as Comrades in Main St. Kremlins."

Altogether, an authentic and readable account of the nature and ritual of Freemasonry, and an invaluable guide to the position of the Church in regard to the lodge.

F.A.M.

LIVING THE INTERIOR LIFE, by Wendelin Meyer, O.F.M.
(Cork: Mercier Press, 1957, Pp. 189, 1/- stg.)

All readers of spiritual classics probably agree that outside the Holy Scriptures the one book that has a universal appeal is the *Imitation of Christ*. The first two books of that classic are the basis of a series of lectures given and gathered together by a German Franciscan in Germany in 1953; they are intended chiefly for nuns, but their appeal is wider than any cloister. It is an unusual book that will help many people; for some it will be an introduction to the *Imitation*, for others a recall—in either case bringing enrichment to the personality, as it has to countless saints. (St. Therese of Lisieux knew it by heart.) Nuns will find it especially helpful on their monthly day of recollection, as it is well translated—though the typography leaves much to be desired.

Human beings love to talk, even in cloisters—even in Germany: "We all have too much noise and bustle in our affairs, too much talk and too little silence. Our best conference chamber is and will always be the chapel or the quiet, devout recesses of the soul; and there we should diligently consult with God before transacting our affairs. This gives convents the stamp of maturity and brings a quiet profundity to the daily work and the life of the soul. Such comportment on the part of religious can be so impressive and striking as to compel the admiration of the outside world. They experience something of the serene greatness of Christ, above all at times when human consultations are of no avail."

Some readers may feel that the self-questionnaire at the end of each chapter forms the most important part of this book. It consists of four or six pertinent questions under the tactful title, *Let Us Ask Ourselves*. And, in the original, it is not ebullient Australians who are in question but phlegmatic Teutons. But we must be all the same under our skin: "Do my work, my plans and undertakings proceed from calm reflection or with nervous haste? Am I in everything too restless, hasty and precipitate? Why do I allow myself to be rushed in this way?" Yes. Why?

M.O.

* * * * *

GIBBON AND ROME, by E. J. Oliver. London: Sheed and Ward, 1958. Pp. 198. 12/6.

"The calm landscape of the eighteenth century, with its noble perspectives of columns and arches, temples and pavilions, has the fascination of tranquillity and permanence to those who gaze back from scenes clouded with the heat of revolutions and the smoke of bombs." So begins this thoughtful and interesting book. The Age of Reason, that of Voltaire, the Deists, Greuze and Boucher, has been well condemned by Catholics. Yet to return to that self-confident century (which no doubt had its troubles

and was to end in catastrophe) is a solace amid our own troubles. Just recently the late Dr. Collins of Melbourne had thought it of use to write *The Student's Companion to Gibbon* (Melbourne, Hawthorn Press, 1957). Now a very fine appreciation of Gibbon has come in E. J. Oliver's book. Gibbon was fascinated with Rome. At the age of sixteen he ruined his Oxford career by becoming a Catholic. Gibbon with the confidence of the young condemned the "monks of Oxford," and never regretted his enforced departure. John Wesley and Samuel Johnson on the other hand found much to praise in that comfortable Oxford of two centuries ago. Gibbon wrote that Bossuet's books "achieved my conversion, and I surely fell by a noble hand." He was also much influenced by the writings of the Jesuit, Robert Persons, who lived in Elizabethan times. The impetuous youth was received into the Church by a Father Baker, S.J., with a speed that now appears disconcerting. His family packed him off to Lausanne where in a Calvinist minister's home the "various articles of the Romish creed disappeared like a dream." Gradually under the influence of the French writers of that sceptical century he abandoned, what he called, "the prejudices of a Papist or a Protestant." He had become the septic, or the deist, so well known from his taunting adjectives and air of superiority in his famous work *The Decline and the Fall of the Roman Empire*. He was further disillusioned by his love affair with Suzanne Curchod, who eventually married the French statesman, Necker. Disappointed in Faith and in love, Gibbon found an object of adoration in Rome, the Eternal City. What a superb subject! It was so in Gibbon's eyes in the golden days from Trajan to Marcus Aurelius, until the Christians darkened the scene with fanaticism and superstition. Thus is the tone of Chapters XV and XVI on Christianity explained, he wrote with "the pencil of an enemy," as he says himself. The author of the essay under review with great sympathy attempts to show us the motives that urged on Gibbon to disfigure his work with his lack of feeling for the doctrine of Christ, and his cold treatment of women. With serenity, Gibbon died in 1794. His serene style has preserved his book as a masterpiece of English writing, stately but ponderous. It is ironical that he owed much of his style to Pascal and many of his facts to Tillemont "that incomparable guide," as E. J. Oliver points out, and he is continually pointing out interesting things in a style that has caught the stately movement of Gibbon.

T.V.

* * * * *

OUR LADY: QUEEN OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE, by Louis Colin, C.S.S.R. (Cork: Mercier Press, 1958, Pp. 233, 18/- stg.)

Within the last few years Father Colin's name has become well-known on catalogues of Catholic spiritual books in the English-speaking world, though he has probably been writing

for a much longer time in France. We seem to be indebted to the Newman Bookshop in U.S.A. for the English translations. This particular one has been translated by two nuns of Halifax; and it reads very smoothly. With regard to format and typography the Mercier Press is to be congratulated on the workmanship of the publication.

The Cure of Ars used to say that "things would go much better in our lives and in our apostolate, if we gave a bigger share in them to the Most Holy Virgin." Those words occur somewhere in this book; and it is one of the good aspects of Father Colin's writings that he draws freely from the clear rivers of sanctity that have saved France in every era of her wilful self-corruption. We know most of the spiritual writers he mentions—at least by name—though there are several whom we have not met either in French or English. Among these are Willam, Desmaret, Charmot, Bainvel. We quote from Charmot: "The most holy and most powerful of creatures—the Mother of God—was holy and powerful by reason of her plenitude of docility." It may seem a poor compliment—though that is not how it is meant—to note first in an author's book the rich sources from which he has drawn his material. In point of fact most of us are grateful to have our horizons enlarged.

The theme of Father Colin's book is admirably worked out in 12 chapters under three sub-titles: Ideal of the Religious Life, Source of the Religious Life, The Marian Devotion of Religious. Throughout the book we are led to see how closely the life of every Religious and priest can follow the pattern of Our Lady's. Particularly is this so in Mary's life of oblation. It has often occurred to us that the ideal of *service* tends to crowd out the ideal of *oblation* in our modern apostolate, leading eventually to impoverishment and weakness in the soul of the apostle. *Behold the handmaid of the Lord* no longer has the ring of oblation. Perhaps it will be especially as a re-orientation in our dedicated lives that we shall find this book most valuable.

M.O.